The University of Texas Publication

No. 3926 July 8, 1939

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

1939

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AUSTIN

Publications of The University of Texas

The University publishes bulletins four times a month, so numbered that the first two digits of the number show the year of issue and the last two the position in the yearly series. (For example, No. 3901 is the first publication of the year 1939.) These bulletins comprise the official publications of the University, publications on humanistic and scientific subjects, and bulletins issued from time to time by various divisions of the University. The following bureaus and divisions distribute publications issued by them; communications concerning publications in these fields should be addressed to The University of Texas, Austin, Texas, care of the bureau or division issuing the publication: Bureau of Business Research, Bureau of Economic Geology, Bureau of Engineering Research, Bureau of Industrial Chemistry, Bureau of Public School Extracurricular Activities, and Division of Extension. Communications concerning all other publications of the University should be addressed to University Publications, The University of Texas, Austin.

Additional copies of this publication may be procured from the University Publications, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas
at
$1.00 per copy

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PRESS

The University of Texas Publication
No. 3926: July 8, 1939

STUDIES IN ENGLISH
1939

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY FOUR TIMES A MONTH AND ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POST OFFICE AT AUSTIN, TEXAS, UNDER THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912

The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.

Sam Houston

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of Democracy, and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge, and the only security which freemen desire.

Mirabeau B. Lamar

CONTENTS

A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY LOLLARD SERMON CYCLE

By Ernest William Talbert

The publication of Owst's two volumes on medieval sermons in England made known to many what had previously been realized by but a few scholars: the very great importance of the literature of the medieval pulpit.[1] In spite of this, much of the existing sermon literature written and compiled during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries is available only in manuscript or, if printed, generally difficult of access. Students of the course of Lollardy have been comparatively fortunate in having printed editions of both the Latin and the English Wyclyfite sermon compilations.[2] Yet one need but recall the unedited works contained, for example, in MSS *Laing 140, University Library, Edinburgh; Trinity College, Cambridge, 60* and *333; British Museum Additional 24202* and *41321,* to realize that much evidence for the dissemination of Wyclyfite doctrine has been overlooked.[3] In the present study, I wish to call attention to a fifteenth-century sermon cycle in MS *Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, 74 (△.4.12),*[4] which provides us, I believe, with an interesting example of the preaching of Lollard doctrine after it had been declared heretical and had been vigorously attacked.

---

[1]G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1926); *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1933).

[2]*Iohannis Wyclif Sermones,* ed. J. Loserth (Wyclif Soc., 1886–1889), 4 vols. *Select English Works of John Wyclif,* ed. T. Arnold (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869, 1871), I, II, 1–376.

[3]These MSS are mentioned, for example, by Owst, *Preaching,* pp. 229, 136, 239, 131; *Lit. and Pulp.,* p. 284.

[4]Listed in Montague Rhodes James' *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1895), pp. 52–53, as ending at fol. 142^{b}; however, 28 folios are mising (those originally numbered 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 15, 16, 23–5, 27, 28, 32, 38, 42, 43, 52, 53, 58, 60, 63, 65–9, 72, 127).

First, however, a word about the printed Wyclyfite collection of English sermons and about medieval *Artes praedicandi.* The two hundred and ninety-four sermons of the edited English compilation[5] are divided into five groups or series. In the collection as printed there are fifty-four sermons on the gospels for the Sundays of the year; fifty-five on the Sunday epistles; and one hundred and nine for the week days of the year, here called the Ferial group.[6] These three groups, then, roughly represent a *Proprium de Tempore,* or a group of sermons for the office of the season, in contrast to the other two series: the *Proprium Sanctorum,* made up of thirty-eight sermons on the gospels for specific saints' days; and the *Commune Sanctorum,* thirty-one sermons on gospels which may be used for any saint or group of saints. The printed edition follows the order of MS *Bodl. 788,* and thus sets forth the series in the following order: the Sunday Gospel group, the *Commune Sanctorum,* the *Proprium Sanctorum,* the Ferial group, and the Sunday Epistle group. The sermons are comparatively short and aim primarily at giving, and if necessary, explaining, the literal sense of the scriptural passage for the day. After the literal sense is given,[7] the sermons are frequently enlarged by developing the tropological, or moral, sense, which derives from the words of Holy Writ a virtue to be practised or a vice to be avoided.[8]

---

[5]*Supra,* note 2.

[6]The difference in number between the Sunday epistle and gospel group arises from the fact that the Sunday-gospel group does not contain sermons for Christmas day or for the Sixth day after Christmas, whereas the Sunday-epistle group does, although it omits in turn a sermon on the epistle for the Octave of the Epiphany. *Ferial* today, of course, denotes the days of the week upon which no feast is celebrated, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday. The author of this compilation, however, uses it to denote all the days of the week upon which no feast is celebrated, with the exception of Sunday, and at the end of the group he has added seven sermons on gospels for special occasions.

[7]The literal sense of the entire gospel passage may be given first, or the text may be taken up in parts.

[8]The tropological sense is one of the three mystical senses: the other two are the allegorical and the anagogical. The allegorical sense

During this tropological discussion Lollard doctrine is frequently introduced, wherein the author vigorously attacks contemporary abuses perpetrated by the "Caesarian" clergy. Three very frequent means of amplification employed are (1) the use of division and subdivision, (2) the citation of authorities, biblical, patristic, or pholosophical, which are always translated or paraphrased, never given in Latin,[9] and (3) the moving and solution of scholastic doubts which arise from the interpretation of the literal sense and which generally involve a defense of Lollard doctrine.[10] Thus, the sermons have no consistent *dispositio,* or arrangement, although they generally begin with a sentence or two briefly indicating the content of the Bible passage for the day, and occasionally end with a sentence of exhortation. Indeed, save for the author's concern with scholastic subtleties, they might illustrate what *Artes Praedicandi* call the *antiquus,* or homily, type of sermon, whose golden age was the period of the Church Fathers. The homily, however, was not abandoned; it was usually considered to be

---

derives from the words of Holy Writ a truth to be believed; the anagogical sense, a blessing to be hoped for. Nicholas de Lyra, a student of the Jewish commentator Rashi, and, in turn, the commentator who was particularly admired by the. Wyclyfites, has been credited with making the following tag, which explains briefly the prevalent four-fold method of Scriptural exegesis:

> *Littera* gesta docet, quae credas *Allegoria*
> *Moralis* quid agas, quo tendas *Anagogia.*

[9]The passages are either briefly quoted or referred to and are generally taken from the Bible, although the following writers or works are called upon for confirmatory material: Augustine, Gregory the Great, Ambrose, Bernard, Grosseteste, Bede, Origen, Anselm, Jerome, Isidore, Dionysius, Possidius, Josephus, the Koran, Aristotle, and, possibly, Wyclyf's *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae,* as well as a collection of legends.

[10]In this compilation other methods of amplification are, of course, used. For example, save for anecdotes, the multiplication of synonyms, and the marking of the positive, comparative, or superlative of some thing, all of the twenty common methods of amplification listed by Harry Caplan, "Classical Rhetoric and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching," *Classical Philology,* XXVIII (April, 1932), 88–90, can be found without much difficulty.

particularly useful for preaching to the people.[11] Parallel with the development of the homily arose the method of taking only a theme from a scriptural passage and developing it into a sermon. This method was used particularly in the universities; indeed, such a sermon, addressed to clerks, was one of the duties of those taking or having a degree in theology.[12] Consequently, the *Artes Praedicandi* of the Middle Ages were concerned primarily with the Latin university sermon and formulated rules for the development of its theme. The result was that the thematic sermon, after the beginning of the thirteenth century, became increasingly wooden because of a stereotyped *dispositio.* By the early fourteenth century, this *dispositio* was, briefly, (1) the announcement of the theme, (2) the development of the protheme, or prelocution, which led up to the initial prayer, and (3) the development of the principal parts: (a) the introduction of the theme, (b) its division into parts, and (c) the development of the parts by various methods of amplification, the sermon ending with a *clausio,* i.e. with a sentence addressed to God and requesting, for example, that vice be avoided and the good which had been spoken of be bestowed upon preacher and audience.[13]

So much by way of explanation. To return, then, to the fifty-four sermons in MS *Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, 74.* The cycle originally began with the Whitsunday sermon and ended with that for the Sixth Sunday after Easter. Since, however, the first two folios have been lost, the last portion of the Whitsunday sermon ends on what is now the first folio and is immediately followed by the sermon for Trinity Sunday. The present first folio is partially covered by a later paper title on which a sixteenth century hand has written:

---

[11]See, *ibid.,* p. 87, as well as Th.–M. Charland, *Artes Praedicandi, Contribution à l'histoire de la Rhétorique au Moyen Age* (Publications de l'Institute d'Etudes Médiévales d'Ottawa, vol. VII), p. 112.

[12]Charland, pp. 109–112.

[13]*Ibid.,* pp. 110, 136–137, 225, *et passim.*

THESE SERMONS VNDERWRYTTEN WERE / publysed by the Learned Clearke Mr / Wiclyffe, wherein although there be / somthinge not altogether agreable to the great Light *which* it hath / pleased God to reveale vnto / vs at this present tyme yet / Let vs not altogether / condemne the author who / [h]ath bestowed his talent / [ac]cordinge to the measure / . . . *which* he hath mereted in such sorte / . . . [t]hat it is to be feared when / . . . [t]he tyme of accompte / . . . come, he shall / . . . raed before . . . ose. . . .

The cycle develops continuously throughout consecutive sermons most of the material prescribed for preaching by the so-called *Ignorancia Sacerdotum,* which, formulated by Archbishop Peckham in the year 1281, set forth the preaching minimum of England as an elucidation from the pulpit, at least four times a year, of the seven articles of lay-folk faith.[14] The fourteen articles of faith (the creed),[15] the ten commandments, the two precepts of the gospel on love, the seven works of mercy, the seven mortal sins, and the seven principal virtues are all discussed in detail. The seventh prescribed article of lay-folk, however, that of the seven sacraments, is not developed consistently, nor is it discussed in any detail.

Although the author is thus dealing with conventional and commonplace material, his method of developing the individual sermons is of particular importance; for, in spite of the fact that this Sidney Sussex compilation has been noticed by students of Wyclyfite writings, it has never been accurately described, perhaps because comparatively little attention was paid to Middle English sermons and *Artes Praedicandi* prior to Owst's publications. For example, W. W. Shirley, believing that the MS contained another copy of two groups of the printed Wyclyfite English sermons, wrote that "the sermons on the gospels and epistles are thrown together in this MS [*Sidney Sussex College, Cbg., 74*]."[16] Arnold correctly

---

[14]For the Peckham minimum, see *Concilia Magnae Britannicae et Hiberniae,* ed. D. Wilkins (London, R. Gosling *et al,* 1737), II, 54.

[15]See Notes to Appendix, A, *f, infra.*

[16]Walter Waddington Shirley, *A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865), p. 33.

pointed out that the epistle sermons were not those of the printed collection edited from *Bodl. 788,* but he was incorrect in saying that the Sidney Sussex MS contained enlarged *Bodl. 788* Sunday-gospel sermons intermixed with short instructions on a text taken from the epistles.[17] The Sunday-gospel sermons in *Bodl. 788* are in reality used in this Sidney Sussex cycle as the prothemes of Sunday sermons which develop themes taken from the epistles. Moreover, in the sermons of the Sidney Sussex MS, the portion of each sermon devoted to the gospel tract averages little more than two pages, whereas the remainder of each sermon averages about three pages in length. It can be seen, furthermore, from the example given in *A* of the Appendix that the brief material which is added to the gospel sermon, and which precedes the repetition of the theme, is simply the conventional invitation to prayer—a brief plea to God for salvation, which is frequently prefaced by some reference to the contents of the preceding material. After this invitation, in the vast majority of the Sidney Sussex sermons, there follows either the *Pater Noster,* or the *Ave Maria,* or both.

Theoretically, of course, the protheme's sole purpose was to introduce the initial prayer, which was said not only to heighten the audience's devotion but also to insure God's blessing on the preacher so that he might move his audience to win eternal bliss.[18] Indeed, this function of the protheme is apparent in the only sermon which does not contain a *Bodl. 788* Sunday-gospel sermon and whose protheme, consequently, may be the work of the compiler-author of this cycle. Just before the initial prayer is indicated, the author has written:

And þus to amende vs boþe to god and to mon, þat oure offeryng may be plesyng to [god], preye we vnto hym þat ful of mercy is, þat we þis day haue grace hys wordes ȝou to telle, and ȝee thurghe ȝoure hooly lyf to kepe hem in ȝoure soule, þat we may thurghe hem so oure

---

[17]*Sel. Eng. Wks.*, I, xv.

[18]Charland, p. 126.

lyf amende to wone wyth hym in hys blysse þat euere more schal laste.[19]

In spite of the fact that the protheme was theoretically only an introduction to the initial prayer, in practise it often became a pre-sermon, with introduction, division, declaration and confirmation of the parts, dilation, and the prayer as conclusion.[20] Thus there was some precedent for the prothemes of the Sidney Sussex cycle being Wyclyfite Sunday-gospel sermons; and, indeed, further justification can be found for our author's use of those sermons. Many of the gospel sermons contain passages which vigorously attack the vices of the religious orders and the clergy. This is in accordance with the fact that the protheme might, and perhaps frequently did, dwell upon the necessary qualifications of the preacher—a fact that may have caused Waleys, one of the authors of fourteenth century *Artes praedicandi*, to caution the preacher to avoid, while developing the protheme, that which concerned only himself.[21]

In contrast to the printed English Wyclyfite sermons, the *dispositio* of each sermon in the Sidney Sussex cycle clearly reflects the late medieval rules for university preaching. As we might expect, the individual sermons of this vernacular cycle do not follow the precepts as closely as would be expected of the university Latin sermons, for whose composition *Artes Praedicandi* were written. Nevertheless, I know of no other group of Middle English sermons wherein those precepts are so consistently and so obviously followed throughout the entire compilation.[22] The sermon given below under *A* is typical of the others in the Sidney Sussex cycle, not only in that it reflects the rules of the *Artes Praedicandi*,

---

[19]Fol. 19[a]; *infra*, Appendix, B.

[20]Charland, p. 134.

[21]*Ibid.*, p. 355.

[22]The notes in Owst's *Preaching*, pp. 316–330, seem to indicate that the vernacular sermons in the unedited MS *Roy. 18. B. xxiii* likewise follow these rules consistently. Both Owst, *idem*, and Pfander, *The Popular Sermon of the Medieval Friar* (dissertation, N.Y.Univ., 1937), *passim*, point out examples of vernacular sermons reflecting these precepts. In our MS, however, they are applied consistently throughout the cycle.

but also in that it contains part of a continuous course of instruction on one of the articles of lay-folk faith as enumerated by the Peckham minimum.

With two exceptions, the themes in the cycle are taken from the texts used in the printed Wyclyfite Latin and English sermons: the sermon for the second Sunday after Easter develops a theme from I Cor. xiii, 4, *Caritas paciens est,* instead of one from I Peter ii; and the sermon for the Octave of the Epiphany uses a theme from Isaiah xii, 3, which appears only as a concordant passage in the corresponding Latin sermon.[23] These themes, as we might expect, frequently omit or modify words of the Scripture, for such changes were allowable as long as the sense was not perverted.[24] After the theme is given, there follows the protheme, i.e., the corresponding *Bodl. 788* Sunday-gospel sermon,[25] which ends with the invitation to prayer. Then, after the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria* have been said in concert, in each of the fifty-four sermons the theme is repeated, translated, and developed so that the remainder of the sermon falls into the usual three main parts. The first may explain the theme, giving, as in the example below, the basis or the reason for the truth of that theme; frequently it develops an analogy or a natural truth in the course of that explanation. Thus

---

[23]See *Sel. Eng. Wks.*, II, 292–294; *Sermones*, III, 206–212 and 73. There is no *Bodl. 788* Sunday-epistle sermon for the Octave of the Epiphany. On the other hand, the Sidney Sussex cycle does not have sermons for Christmas and the sixth day after Christmas, whereas the *Bodl. 788* Sunday-epistle group does.

[24]Charland, pp. 114–119.

[25]The only exception occurs in the sermon for the sixth Sunday after Trinity. The protheme for that sermon uses the same text and the same division as does the corresponding *Bodl. 788* Sunday-gospel sermon. However, the translation of the gospel text is different and the division is developed differently. Moreover, a discussion with confirmatory passages, which points out that the new law is harder to fulfill than the old, takes the place of the *Bodl. 788* discussion of how the prelates and friars make a new law for themselves. See *infra* Appendix, B and *Sel. Eng. Wks.*, I, 14–17.

the next repetition of the theme comes as a confirmation or as a concluding sentence of the first part of the sermon.[26] Since an elucidation of the material prescribed for preaching by the Peckham minimum is developed throughout the cycle, a discussion of one of the articles of lay-folk faith is generally continued from one sermon to the next. That discussion is, of course, divided and subdivided in a manner familiar to all readers of medieval didactic compilations, and is generally begun after the repetition of the theme which ends the first part of the sermon. In the vast majority of the sermons in this cycle, then, the enumeration of the parts of a division or subdivision (the "process") is either indicated or given in full after the second repetition of the theme. The parts of the division are then developed, and the resulting discussion is generally somewhat arbitrarily divided by the third repetition of the theme. A concordant passage from the Bible or the Church Fathers may, as in the sermon given below, provide a transition between the second repetition of the theme and the process of the continued division or subdivision. Frequently, however, such a transition is lacking, and the author may plunge into an enumeration of the parts of a division, some of which are to be covered in the rest of the sermon. Thus, instead of the development of divisions of the theme, the division and subsequent development of one of the articles of lay-folk faith complete most of the sermons. Into this discussion, the author of the Sidney Sussex cycle has inserted his epistle theme so that it divides the development of the parts. After or with the last, i.e., the fourth, repetition of the theme, comes the *clausio*—a hortatory remark which may briefly refer to the sermon's content and which is accompanied by a petition to God or Christ for salvation, which likewise generally refers to the sermon's content. Infrequently the *clausio* also contains a concordant or confirmatory passage, as it may in the university sermon.[27] In this way the theme is repeated four times after

[26] Charland, pp. 136–163.
[27] *Ibid.*, 217–218.

the protheme and, save for the first repetition, usually marks the end of, or the transition between, three fairly equal units.[28]

The sixteenth-century ascription of the sermons to Wyclyf is of little value; for it seems likely that the prothemes in this cycle, with but one exception,[29] have the same antecedent as the printed Sunday-gospel sermons: that is, they apparently represent a tradition not greatly different, but nevertheless distinct, from that found in the *Bodl. 788* compilation.[30] Thus, with only a few relatively unimportant exceptions, the references to contemporary events found in the printed Sunday-gospel sermons are likewise

---

[28]There are a few exceptions to this. In six of the sermons the theme is repeated more than four times (in four of them only five times). Also two of the sermons having folios missing should be noted here: one has four repetitions of the theme; the other, five. However, even in the sermon wherein the theme is repeated eight times, an equal tripartite division is preserved. The sermon wherein eight repetitions occur is that for the sixth Sunday after Trinity; it has (1) an analogy of the distant traveller to the Christian soul, (2) a discussion of the four ways to heaven, (3) a discussion of envy. The same tripartite division is preserved when the theme is repeated less than four times (three times in six sermons, twice in one). Finally, in the sermon for the sixth Sunday after Easter the second and third repetitions of the theme come close together.

[29]See *supra*, note 25 and *infra*, Appendix, B.

[30]It would be impossible, even if it were desirable, to record here all of the readings in the prothemes of the Sidney Sussex MS which vary from those of the *Bodl. 788* Sunday-gospel sermons. Although such readings occur continually throughout the cycle, they increase in number, if not in kind, after the sermon for the fourth Sunday after the Octave of the Epiphany; see *infra*, Notes to Appendix, A, *a*. Until all of the MSS of the Wyclyfite sermons have been collated, it is impossible to indicate more exactly the relationship between this Sidney Sussex MS and the text printed from MS *Bodl. 788*. I should like to take this opportunity, however, to correct an egregiously careless error that I made in an earlier article, "The Date of the Composition of the English Wyclifite Collection of Sermons," *Speculum*, XII (Oct. 1937), 464, note 4. Miss Allen mentions one MS, not two, i.e., *MS Bodley Don. c. 13* is mentioned in both the *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle* and the *L. T. L. S.* My reasons for the spelling "Wyclyf" are those of S. H. Thomson's, "Wyclif or Wyclyf." *Eng. Hist. Rev.* LIII (Oct., 1938), 675–678.

found in the Sidney Sussex prothemes; and hence the Sidney Sussex cycle must have been compiled at the earliest *ca.* 1412, for it contains a passage in the protheme of the Palm Sunday sermon which was probably composed at about that date—i.e., about twenty-eight years after Wyclyf's death.[31] Dialectal characteristics indicate the territory in or around north-west Warwick or south Staffordshire as the provenance of this redaction.[32]

The compiler-author of this cycle, then, was not Wyclyf, as a statement of Owst's might seem to indicate,[33] but one of his followers; for it seems logical to assume that only a Wyclyfite would use, as an integral part of his sermons, other sermons which had been compiled and enlarged from *ca.* 1377 to *ca.* 1412, and which contained Wyclyf's heretical conception of the Eucharist, his emphasis upon the absolute truth of the literal sense of the Bible, and his heretical doctrine of dominion with its concomitant condemnation of pope, prelate, friar, and priest.[34]

---

[31]I have discussed this passage in *Speculum*, XII, 472.

[32]Dialectal characteristics which appear in this cycle's prothemes but not in the Sunday-gospel sermons of the *Bodl. 788* collection, and which can be localized, are O. E. *a* followed by *m*, *n* spelled *o* (e.g., *mon, mony, onswere, monkynd*) and O.E. *ȳ*, *ȳ* retained as a front round vowel, spelled *u, ui, uy* (e.g., *hulles, huire, fuyre, huyde*); *-(e)þ* for pres. ind. 3rd sg., *-e(n)* for pres. ind. pl., and *-ing* for pres. ptcl. are retained. The same characteristics are apparent in the rest of the sermons. A portion of Shropshire is likewise included within the boundaries of these dialectal characteristics; see S. Moore, S. B. Meech, H. Whitehall, "Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries," *Michigan Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, XIII (1935), and the area included within the isophonic lines, G, H, K and west of lines D, F, *ibid.*, map I. Although I am unaware of other copies of this sermon cycle, instances of eyeskips and dittography in the gospel sermon material, as well as examples elsewhere of dittography and confusions in writing in Latin, indicate that the collection in MS *Sidney Sussex 74* was copied from another codex.

[33]*Preaching*, p. 361.

[34]*Sel. Eng. Wks.*, I, 1–162, *passim*. It is interesting to note that the folio (originally 127) on which a discussion of the Eucharist should

With perhaps the exception of two passages,[35] there are, however, no statements outside of the protheme which in themselves definitely show the author's Lollardy. His occasional attacks in the body of the sermons on the pride and covetousness of pope, prelate, friar, and priest, as part of a general attack on those sins, can be paralleled, as Owst has shown, in orthodox sermons. Nevertheless, these sermons were meant to be, and probably were, preached to the laiety throughout the year—a fact indicated not only by the lay instruction provided throughout the cycle but also by the many direct remarks of the preacher to his audience.

In þuse sixe vers is muche wut schewed, and namely hou þat mon schal haue hym to his neygbore. Bote for to declare þis now, þe tyme is to schorte; bote Y schal heraftur, ȝef god wul ȝeue me grace. And now wul Y tellen ȝou forþ þe firste comaundement of þe loue of god, as Y seide on sonneday.[36]

These sermons are certainly not synodal sermons, wherein criticism of the congregated clergy frequently occurred. Hence, such attacks on clerical vices, in vernacular sermons containing definitely Lollard doctrine in the prothemes, certainly seem to be the result of more than "the indiscreet zeal of the orthodox."[37] By 1412, indeed, such outspoken criticism in lay sermons was dangerous, for it directly violated the significant order of the Oxford Constitutions confirmed and promulgated by the St. Paul's

---

have appeared is torn out in the Sidney Sussex MS; *ibid.*, 133–134. However, other shorter references to this Wyclyfite doctrine appear in the Sidney Sussex cycle.

[35]In one passage the author censures the worship of graven images at the expense of God's image, man; fol. 71b; cf. comparable passages in *Sel. Enk. Wks.*, III, 463–464, *The English Works of Wyclif*, ed. F. D. Matthews (*E.E.T.S., O.S.* 74) p. 210. In another, he apparently refers to the friars' attack on Lollard preaching; and calls the friars the children of 'Caym'—Wyclyf's and the Lollards' favorite acrostic, fol. 83a.

[36]Fol. 55a.

[37]Cf. Owst, *Lit. and Pulp.*, p. 285, wherein he expresses some of his conclusions about the preaching of satire and complaint.

synod of January, 1409, that "Predicator conformet se auditorio, aliter puniatur."[38]

An attempt to identify this Lollard compiler-author seems fruitless until further studies of centers of Lollardy and a more nearly complete corpus of Wyclyfite writings are available.[39] His style, however, is distinctive, particularly when it is compared with that of the *Bodl. 788* compilation. In the Sidney Sussex cycle, for example, the moralized properties of things and allegoric figures are the rule rather than the exception, whereas the primary purpose of the printed compilation was to teach the *letter* of the Bible.[40] Again, *characterismus*, or "vivid description," appears frequently as a means of amplification throughout the cycle; and thus, in contrast with the printed collection, there are many interesting and realistic details of

---

[38]Wilkins, III, 314; cf. Herbert B. Workman, *John Wyclif* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), II, 417–419 for the date of the Southern Convocation, and *infra*, note 51.

[39]I have been unable to find an immediate source for the sermons of this cycle (excluding, of course, the prothemes). The further publication of Latin and vernacular sermons and of such sermon material as Owst has dealt with would undoubtedly throw some light on the problem; for, dealing with material which was preached continually and developed conventionally, this cycle naturally has many affinities with such Latin and vernacular literature as, for example, Gregory the Great's *Moralium Libri*, [Migne, *P. L.*, LXXVI, 556–558] or the compilations of Perrault, and hence of Lorens or of Michel of Northgate (in the division and development of instruction in the seven deadly sins). Again, instruction in the virtues is part of an extended figure which is developed from the sermon for the second Sunday after the Octave of the Epiphany until the end of the cycle. This figure is based upon the common medieval analogy between man's soul and a city, or a castle—a figure which became a commonplace and which appears in Latin and vernacular pulpit literature from the sermons of St. Anselm and the *De Anima* ascribed to Hugh of St. Victor to the *Festial* of Myrc and the *Summa Predicantium* of Bromyard. Cf. *infra*, Notes to Appendix, A, *f*.

[40]See, for example, the sermon under *A* below. Again, the properties of the adder, dove, and raven are the basis for about a third of the discussion in the sermon for Quinquagesima Sunday, fol. 110b; while the moralized properties of the nightingale form the basis of the discussion after the first repetition of the theme in the sermon for the twenty-first Sunday after Trinity, fol. 61.

contemporary life. We have described, for example, the covetous man, wordly counsellors, the intemperate man, the worldly churchman.[41] Such a description may be put into the mouth of the fiend, as in the following passage which the author uses to illustrate part of a discussion of the second of the five wits, that of hearing. The devil is, of course, the evil speaker to whom one should not listen.

Bote take we now good heede what lore þe deuel techeþ. He byheteþ mon feire longe lyfe to haue, and þat is a þing þat mon muche coueiteþ. He techeþ hym to be proud and gret boste to make, to take mony wurchipes and sette nouȝt by þe symple, to spende largely and waste to holden vp his name, to bere wratþe in his herte and loth to forȝeue, to suffre noun, ȝef he may, for to þrife bysiden hym þat þei be nouȝt sett by so muche as he is, and þat bysye hym aboute to bakbite his neiȝbore, to appeiren his state in al þat he con, with mony grete lesynges ȝef he noun oþer may. 'ȝef þou here an yuel tale,' he seiþ, 'loke þou bere hit forth. Ete faste and drinke faste þe beste þou may gete and tak þe wymmen ynow; chese of þe feireste, be it nunne, wyf, or wydewe, maiden or chast. Or ȝef þou may noun oþer do, tak þe comyn wymmen and let not þi ȝouthehod passen þus awey. Site longe vp in riot and lye longe in bedde. Sei bote fewe preieres, let oþur preie for þee. For þou see a sacryng it is good inowh. Hold þe at þe tauerne and pley at þe cheker. ȝef þou owe men any dette loke þat þou paye it not. Loke þou swere grete oþes and seie, "Men wolen not elles leue me." Get þe longe pikede schon and dagge þikke þi cloþes, and ȝef þou priuely stele a þing quyte hit her aftur. Loke þou speke foule wordes to maken men to lauhe. Sermoun nedeþ þe noun to here, bote wende vn to þe bere beytynge, or schotyng, or wrastelynge, or suche oþer pley. Wher to schaltou schryue þee or paske euene come?' þus ben feire wordes and likyng to þe flech, bote alle þuse ben contrarie to þe hele of monnesoule.[42]

The author also has a predilection for alliterative word groups, particularly in long lists of words or series, which may occasionally be joined by an end-rhyme.

---

[41] Folios 29b, 64a, 114a, and 135b. For the continuity in rhetorical tradition of this device of amplification, see W. G. Crane's summary in *Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance* (N. Y., Columbia Univ. Press, 1937), p. 161.

[42] Fol. 96a.

Pryuey robberes ben þer many and maynteined by þuse maisterlynges, as false budeles and bailefes, false heyewardes and rayleres, kuttepurses and mucheres, false buggeres and sulleres, þat falsely desceyuen men with sleiȝtes and with whiles, false assysoures and okereres, false auditoures and resceyuoures, false aduoketes and pledoures, false somnoures and notaries, and alle suche þat by sleyȝte taken falsely mennes good, leches and phiciscyens, tauerneres and tolleres, false seruauntes in hire werk þat taken þer ful huyre.[43] Bote on þe contrarie maner vsen we oure strengþe, in bostyng and betyng and puttyng of þe ston and castyng of þe axetre, in wrastlyng and schetyng, to drawe a strong bowe, to ete faste and to drinke and lecherye to vsen, to slepe and to sitten ydul and ouersette þe poure, to punische þe feble and pursewe þe meke, to scorne and swere grete oþes, to curse and to chide, to flatere and to glose, þe treuþ to distruye, hoþe to suffren hoot and cold, hunger, þurst, and nede, wakyng and werynesse with mony grete periles, in wyntur and in somer, in whet and in druye, boþe in watur and in lond, ofte in poynt of deth for wynnyng of þis worldes good and plesyng of men . . .[44]

Other published Lollard works having an alliterative style are *Lincolniensis, Vita Sacerdotum,* and *On the Seven Deadly Sins.* It seems impossible, however, to suggest that this cycle is by Hereford, the Wyclyfite whom E. P. Jones and Workman have suggested as the author of the other three works;[45] for Hereford recanted in the spring of 1390 and persevered in his orthodoxy. Moreover, in the autumn of 1417, at about eighty years of age, he probably retired to die at the Charterhouse of St. Anne at Coventry.[46] Nevertheless, in spite of our inability to identify the author of the Sidney Sussex cycle,[47] we can,

---

[43]Fol. 80b.

[44]Fols. 6b–7a.

[45]Workman, *op. cit.*, I, 330; E. P. Jones "The Authenticity of Some English Works Ascribed to Wyclif," *Anglia,* XXX, 261–268.

[46]Following Workman, *op. cit.*, II, 336–339.

[47]It is true that some of the unpublished Lollard tracts and sermons, for example, do have passages strickingly similar to some in this cycle. However, one must remember that the conventional material dealt with would probably be developed conventionally. Compare, for example, the description of worldly churchmen printed below in Appendix A, p. xx, with a passage which Owst prints from MS *Addit. 41321,* a sermon compilation which is also probably of Lollard origin; *Lit. and Pulp.*, pp. 282–284.

I believe, arrive at some conclusion as to the reason for its compilation.

Since 1382, the Lollards had been harried by the orthodox zeal of the two archbishops Courtenay and Arundel. Particularly after the latter's translation to the see of Canterbury did the Wyclyfites encounter an energetic and able opponent, who systematically and effectively attacked the Lollard heresy. Indeed, March 2, 1401, saw the burning of Sawtre, the first Lollard martyr. His martyrdom, however, did not stop Lollard preaching:

> . . . for ȝif men dreden bodili peynes and deþ, and þerfore ceessen to telle openly þe treuþe, þei ben wiþ þis vnable to resceyue þe blisse of heuene; and ȝif þei seyn openly and sadly þe treuþ of god, no þing may harmen hem so þat þei kepen pacience and charite.[48]

In 1402, for example, Lewis Clifford, one of the Lollard gentry, laid before Arundel an exposition of the teachings of the Lollards and the names of the leading preachers of that heresy.[49] Moreover, from other sources, we know that such men as William James, Robert Hoke, James Reseby, William Thorpe, and the irrepressible Peter Payne continued the preaching and defense of 'God's law'—not to mention the Oxford Lollards who were resisting Arundel's encroachment upon the university, or such Bohemian followers of Wyclyf as Nicholas Faulfiss, George of Knychniez, or Paul Craw. It became increasingly difficult, however, to avoid being summoned as suspect, and, after having been summoned, to avoid punishment.[50] In November, 1407, as

---

[48]*Eng. Wks.*, p. 21.

[49]Their names are not given, however, in either *Thomae Walsingham quondam monachi S. Albani Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, no. 28), II, 253 or *The Chronicle of England by John Capgrave*, ed. F. C. Hingeston (Rolls Series, no. 1), p. 280.

[50]James recanted by Nov. 1399 but abjured his heresy a second time in March 1420; Hoke was called before Repington in Jan. 1406; Thorpe was examined in 1407; Reseby fled to Scotland *ca.* 1407, where the Bohemian Craw was 'consumed,' not until July 1432 however; Payne fled to *Bohemia ca.* 1416 where he died in prison after devoting himself to the cause of the Taborites. For a brief discussion of these men, see Workman, *op. cit.*

part of Arundel's determined attempt to stamp out Lollardy, the Constitutions of Oxford had been formulated by the Southern Convocation[51] and, among other measures aimed at crushing heresy, had tightened the examination for an episcopal license to preach and had limited the sermons of parish priests and other licensed persons to the articles of lay-folk faith as enumerated by the Peckham minimum. By 1412, those constitutions had been reaffirmed by a provincial synod in 1409 and indirectly supported by Parliament on November 13, 1411.[52]

In view of the above considerations, therefore, this Sidney Sussex cycle apparently represents an interesting and ingenious attempt to continue the preaching of Lollard doctrine after 1411 by weaving the Wyclyfite Sunday-gospel sermons into the fabric of a sermon cycle which develops in a manner prescribed by university preaching the topics of lay-folk faith as prescribed by the orthodox. Later in the century while writing his *Dictionarium Theologicum,* Dr. Gascoigne testifies to the fact that these measures of Arundel's were ultimately effective. Gascoigne

---

[51]Wilkins, III, 306.

[52]Parliament was concerned specifically with Arundel's right of visitation at Oxford; for the Archbishop, as part of a well-laid plan to crush Lollardy, was determined to continue his attempt to purge the university of certain heretical Lollard doctrines. These doctrines had been drawn up, after much delay, by a standing committee which had been instituted by the Constitutions of Oxford. For a discussion of the various stages of the struggle between Arundel and Oxford, see Workman, II, 359–373, who follows *Snappe's Formulary,* ed. H. E. Salter (*O.H.S.*, no. 80), pp. 90–144. Finally, on Nov. 13, 1411, the Archbishop presented a petition to Parliament which rehearsed the history of the case and demanded that his right of visitation be confirmed. Parliament then granted that 'Aceciam quod eadem cedula et omnia in ea contenta sint tanti et talis valoris effectus et auctoritatis et eosdem valorem affectum et auctoritatem habeant et teneant acsi in presenti parliamento et per auctoritatem ejusdem parliamenti facta extitissent,' L. L. Shadwell, *Enactments in Parliament concerning Oxford and Cambridge,* (*O.H.S.*, no. 58), I, 13. The Lollards apparently regarded this action of Parliament as supporting the Constitutions of Oxford and hence as being an attempt to keep God's law from the people. See *Speculum,* XII, 472.

—who was contemporary with Reginald Pecock, the defender of clerical muteness—considers the Constitutions of Oxford, originally formulated to suppress the Lollard heresy, to be the cause not only of the lamentable decline in the quality of preaching but also the alarming neglect of that priestly office.[53]

APPENDIX

A

Dominica iij post pasch. [fol. 133b]

Deum timete, prima petir ii°. Crist telleþ in þis gospel *þat þer is nyȝ a luytel tyme and þei schal not see hym*, for he schal be ded and buryed; for þuse wordes of crist weren seid þe nexte þursday byforen his deth; and aftur seiþ crist to hise disciples þat þer schal sewe a more tyme and þenne þei schulen see crist in diuerse tymes, fro þat he roos to tyme of his ascencioun, to coumforte hise disciples with þe syȝte of hym.[a] Bote for crist haþ lymyted þe tyme þat he schulde come to his fadur, crist seiþ þis tyme schal be luytel *for he goþ to his fadur*. For cristes lyinge in his sepulcre and also his beyng here was luytel tyme as god lymytede, to onswere to his ascensioun. *And somme of* [disciplis of] *crist seiden þus to gedur, What is þis þat crist seiþ to vs, a luytel and aftur ȝe schulen see me, for I go to my fadur. And þei seiden, What is þis luytel, for we wyten neuer what he meneþ. And iesus wiste þat hise disciples wolden asken hym of þis unknowynge, and he seide þus to hem; ȝe asken of þis among ȝou, þat Y seide, a luytel tyme schal come, and þenne ȝe schal not see me, and seþen a luytel tyme bote more tyme, and þenne ȝe schal see me. Forsoþe, forsoþe, Y seye to ȝou, for ȝe schulen boþe grete and wepe, bote þe world þenne schal ioye, and þenne ȝe schulen be sorweful, bote ȝoure sorwe schal turne vnto ioye.* And þis was soth of þe

---

[53] *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, ed. J. E. T. Rogers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881), pp. 34, 44, 61, 181. For the value of Gascoigne's testimony, see Owst, *Preach. in Med. Eng.*, pp. 41, 141–142. Owst ends the discussion effectively by saying: " . . . if popular rumour carried the news of some too outspoken address to the ears of the bishop or his officers, there would be a Henry Wynnegode, some Official-Peculiar, at the offender's heels. The suspicious prelate might even summon a synod in a neighbouring church, and have up the 'pseudo-predicatores' at almost a moment's notice. Who could afford to preach, without thinking twice, and more, in such circumstances? *Sic transit gloria pulpiti!*"

aposteles aftur crist was rysen, for firste þei made more sorwe, and seþen lasse whenne þei hadden ioye. And worldly men contrarien hem, þat firste han ioy and aftur sorwe, for þei ioyeden of þe aposteles sorwe and sorweden of þe aposteles ioy. And eft crist tellep a kyndely saumple to printe þis word more in þer herte.

A womman, seiþ crist, whenne scheo traueilleþ with childe, haþ sorwe of hire peyne, bote aftur whenne scheo is delyuered, scheo haþ ioy of hure child, and forzeteþ hire former sorwe, for a man is boren in to þe world. And þerfore ze han sorwe now, bote Y schal see zou eft, and zoure herte schal haue ioye, and no man schal taken hit fro [fol. 134a] *zou.* Þis womman, to cristes entent, is oure modur holychirche, and euery part þerof þat is also holychirche. And al so longe as we lyuen here, we ben traueillyng of childe, to bringe oure soule to surete fro bysy sorwe of þis world, and so to bringe forþ þe hool man to blisse boþe in body and in soule. And whenne we comen to þis state, we þenken not on oure former sorwe to oure anuye or to oure mornyng, for ioy of þe ende þat seweþ; bote we þenken in oure herte þat for þis peyne þat we han now, we schulen her after haue muche ioy whenne we ben ful maad in þe world. And þat schal neuer be doun fully byfore þat we comen to blisse, for we mornen til þat tyme. For we may lyztly perische fro lyf, bote þenne a man is fully maad, whenne he is corouned in ioy of heuene, for þenne is he certeyne to lyue in blisse euer more with outen peyne.

Clerkes seyen þat when a mon is brouzt þus to godes chaumbre, þenne is he fully spoused with god, and dowed, boþe in body and soule, of foure doweres of þe body. Crist tok ernes in þe world, for he com noht of his modur as oþer men comen in to þis world. By myracle was he boren of hure; and he ne brak not þe cloystre of hure, bote, as þe sonne comeþ þoru þe glas, so crist come fro his modur wombe. And þis more[5] zift is called of clerkes, dower of bodyly sutelte, and ofte vsede crist þis dower fro þe tyme þat he was rysen. Þe secounde dowar of þe body is clepid agylite, þat is swyftnesse þer of to meue hou a man wole; and þis dower vsede crist whenne he wente vpon þe watur, and specialy at þat tyme þat he stey in to heuen. Þe þridde dower of þe body is incoruptibilite, þat þe body may not dye ny be broken by no þing; and þuse doweres knew þe fend whenne he alleggyde vn to crist þat he schulde noht hurten his fote, zef he lepte doun fro þe temple. And by vertu of þis dower þe knyztes braken not cristes thyes, ny, whenne he com in at þe zates, bordes breken not his body. Þe ferþe dower and þe laste is clernesse of mannes body, whenne hit schynet brizte in heuen as þe mone or oþer sterres; and þis dower tok crist to hym in tyme of his transfygurynge. And herfore seide petre þenne, þat good were hym to be þere, for þis is þe heieste dower þat falleþ to mannes body.

---

[1]MS, morne; cf. *Sel. Eng. Wks.*, I, 142.

And aftur þuse foure doweres fallen foure vn to þe soule. Þe firste and þe moste dower onswereþ to þe laste of þe body, þat a soule blessyd in heuen haþ cleer knowyng of al þing, in heuen and erþe and helle þat is or was or euer shal be. And seþen a man haþ delyte to see a pley here in erþe, or anoþer wondurful þing, þe wuche his body is fed whit, muche more þis cleer syȝte of god and alle hise creatures schulde fully fede þe blessyde soule, and þer aftur blisse þe body. And [fol. 134b] herfore seiþ oure iesus, in þe gospel of seynt Iohn, þat þis [is] lyf whit outen ende, to knowe þe fadur and þe sone. For þenne men knowen in þis myrrour alle creatures þat may be; and þis cleer syȝte is more ioyful þen any tunge may telle here. Þe secounde dower of þe soule is vertu ful knowyng to kepe, so þat knowyng of on þing is not contrarie to anoþer. And riȝt as þe body schal euer laste, for acord of alle hise parties, so monnes wytt schal euer laste for lokyng in þe firste miroure; and so man forȝeteþ noht in heuen þinges[2] þat he sum tyme knew. Þe þridde dower of þe soule is redynesse for to knowe alle þinges þat man wol, hou ofte þat he wol þenke vpon hem; for ȝef he traueylede in þis þouȝt any þing aȝeyn[3] his wille, he were noht fully in blisse, ny whit outen a nuyouse peyne. And neuerþeles we byleuen þat seyntes haue what þei wol haue, and þei wolen noun yuele þing. And þus men grounden mony blisses, bote alle ben brouȝte to þuse foure þat we can rikene in holy seyntes. As þe four[þ]e doweres of men in blisse, onswering to þe firste of þe body, is sutelte of mannesoule, þat hit takeþ alkynnes treuþe, and herby it is[4] vndisposed to caste out on treuþe by anoþer; bote as mony blesside bodyes ben to gedur in on place, so many blesside knowynges ben to gedur in on soule. Surete of suche goodes may not faille to þuse seyntes, seþen þei seen clerly in god hou it is nede al þis to be. And so þei wyten hou þei haue al þ ioy þat þei wolde, seþen hem wonteþ no kynnes þing þat þei schulden desyre to haue.

Pray we to god þis syȝte to haue, þat we in heuen may see his face, endelasly to purchipen hym for his mercy and his grace, &c. *Pater et Aue.*

Deum timete, vbi prius.[4] Þuse wordes ben to seie,*Drede ȝe god* to see þe merueilles of god, his myȝt and hise maystries, þat he haþ wrouȝt her byfore and vche day wurcheþ. We may fynde mony causes oure lord for to drede, by pharao and hise folk in þe olde lawe, Ierusalem and Nynyue, with Sodom and Gomorre. And in many mo places god haþ schewyd his maistrie, and vche day among riche and poure, to rikene alle þinges on rewe þat man may muse on. Of þe grete myȝt of god, man auhte wel to drede hym; for boþe oure lyf

[2]MS, þinkes.

[3]MS, aȝeyn aȝeyn.

[4]MS, is not vndisposed; cf. *Sel. Eng. Wks.*, I, 143.

[4]MS, vbi prius.

and oure deth, seknesse and hele, longe tyme and luytel, plente and pouerte, wete and druye, fair and foule, boþe ioy and peyne—al lyȝt in his lordchipe to do what hym likeþ. May þer noun hym whitstande, be he neuer so grete, þat he ne schal rykene to foren hym and stonde whit nakyd sydes to resceyue as he haþ wrouȝt þe while he here lyuede, as seynt poule witnesseþ where he þus seiþ, *Omnes nos oportet manifestari ante tribunal christi, ut recipiat vnusquisque prout gessit in corpore, sive bonum, sive malum.*[b] Alle vs byhoufeþ to be schewyd before [fol. 135a] þe sege of god, þat vche of vs resceyue as we haue wrouȝt in body, be hit good or yuel. Awey we schal not ascape, bote ouþer to peyne or to ioye, by myȝt of oure god. And þerfore seiþ þe prophete þus in þe sauter boke, *Timeat dominum omnis terra: ab eo autem commoueantur omnes inhabitantes terram.*[c] Al erþe drede hit þe lord; and alle þat dwellen þer inne, be þei meuyd of hym. For he seide, and þei weren made. He comaundide, and þei weren wrouȝt þorw myȝt of his word. Wyndes and watres, sonne and mone, ston, tre, and grasse—alle þei bowen at his word and doun as he hem byddeþ. And þerfore, *Drede ȝe*[5] *god*, as I first seide.

Þe drede of god whit loue putteþ out synne, *Timor domini expellit peccatum,*[d] and makeþ man to wynne mercy, and hise dedes medeful. And al oþer yuel drede is dryuen awey whit charite. *Perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem.*[e] For þat is þe þridde engyne, as Y byfore haue seid, þe wuche haþ sixtene bowes; and of þe firste Y tolde ow.[f] Þe secounde bowh of charite is clepid benignite, þat is mildenesse of maneres, of word, and of dede, fair spekynge with alle men and sobre in his werkes, whit outen malice of herte, or any yuele whiles. Charite is not enuyouse, þat is þe þridde bough, bote ioyful of mennes welfare and sori of þer yuel fare. For he þat is enuyouse he breydeþ on þe deuel; and suche may see no good in oþer þat ne hit hem sore forþinkeþ, like to þe eddur þat is so ful of venym þat þer may growe abouten his denne no good grene herbe. Þe venym of þe eddur, þe prophet seiþ, is vndurneþe hire lippes, *Venenum aspidum sub labiis eorum.*[g] Muche mater may men haue of þis synne to speke, bote charite is ioyful of mennes welfare and haþ noun enuye to any maner man. Charite doþ not wykedly, þe furþe bowh seiþ, and þus god techeþ vs where he þus seiþ, *Quiescite agere peruerse discite benefacere.*[h] For charite bysyeth hym no man to harme, bote doþ þe goode to alle in al þat he may. And suche men, as þe sauter telleþ, schulen dwelle with god in heuen, *Domine quis habitabit &c.*[i] And he þat yuel doþ he hateþ verray lyȝt, and so he cheseþ for to wende where þat derkenesse is. *Qui male agit, odit lucem, ut non manifestentur opera eius.*[j] Here may men speke of vntrewe seruauntes, boþe to god and to man, þat doun yuele hire dedes. Þe fyfte bouh is þis, charite is

---

[5]MS, dredet god. The only instance of the theme being neither underlined nor identical with its other repetitions.

not blowen whit pruyde. Boste makeres of þis world, dedeynous and gettoures, folk þat sechen wurchipes and self willy men, wise men in þer oune syȝte þat þinken þat þei don beste, and suche þat tellen muche by hemself for any worldly good—fayrnesse, strengþe, or kunnyng, þe wuche þei haue of god—þuse ben blowen with pride þat charite forsakeþ. For suche ben here hye a while, bote sone þei falle lowe. And so dude lucifer þat lurneþ folk þis lessoun. And þerfore, *Drede ȝe god,* as I firste seide.

Þe sixte bough of charite coueiteþ noun hie state, as þe more part of þe pepul doun now o daies. For þer is [fol. 135b] nouþer wel nyȝ now, ȝunge ny old, leride ny lewede, religiouse ny oþur, þat þei ne coueite in þis world in gret state for to be, in baylly, in office, in state or dignite, contrarie to cristes lore þat hym self schewede. Whenne folk wolde haue maad hym kyng, as þe gospel telleþ, he forsok suche worldly state and fleyþ awey fro hem, and tauȝte so hise disciples, where he þus seiþ, *Reges gencium dominantur eorum: et qui potestatem habent*[6] *super eos, benefici vocantur. Vos autem non sic: sed qui maior est inter vos, fiat minister.*[k] Here crist techeþ vs þat we schulden be lowe and casten vs more to serue þen to hie state, and namely men of holychirche among alle oþur. And we hit semeþ now a dayes coueiten moste hye state, whit symonye on sere wyse—ȝef al we ben vnable to be in lordes seruyces, in lewede monnes office—to gete chirches and byschopriches, denryes and archedeaconyes, with conformyng to þe world, with ȝiftes and with preieres, with haukes and with houndes[7] to occupie oure tyme, and aftur waste þe chirche goodes in boste and in pruyde, on hie horses and strumpetes and on day holdynges, on baselardes and gurdeles herneysed with seluer, on tregetoures and mynystreles to crye hire name aboute, to be holden in hie state among þe comune pepul. Bote þe cely parischenes schulen buye[8] al to gedur. And ȝet þuse flateryng freres þat sey þei ben poure, to haue þe wurchep and þe state of maister of diuinite, and is als wyse byfore as euer is he aftur, wole spende on his pilyoun and on his fest makynge mony score mark of poure mennes penyes and neuer profiteþ aftur as he dude byfore, bote to be clepid a maister, þat crist hym forfendeþ, *Nolite vocari rabby, neque vocemini magistri.*[l] Wol ȝe not be clepid maister, ny be ȝe not clepyd maistres, for on is ȝoure maister wuche þat is in heuen. God spekeþ of suche prestes on þis wise by his prophete, *Peccata populi mei comedent, et ad iniquitatem eorum, subleuabunt animas eorum. Et erit sicut populus, sic sacerdos: et visitabo super eum vias eius, et cogitaciones eius reddam ei.*[m] Þe synne of my pepul þei schulen ete, and lifte vp þe soules of hem to hire wykedenesse, and þenne schal it be suche as is þe pepul, suche is þe prest; and I schal visite on hym

[6]MS, *habunt.*
[7]MS, hondes.
[8]Aphetic from of *abye,* 'pay the penalty for,' 'suffer.'

hise weyes, and quyten hym hise þouȝtes, *quia a propheta usque ad sacerdotem omnis auericie student.*[n] For fro þe prophete to be prest, alle þei studyen coueitise. And þer þei coueiten hie state, and þe chirche vnþryueth, and wykednesse [fol. 136a] waxeþ more and more, as crist seide hit schulde. And charite of mony waxeþ wondur cold, *quoniam habundabit iniquitas, refrigescet caritas multorum.*[o]

Anoþer day Y wol tellen ȝou forþ of þuse bowes; for, for wantyng of charite, mony lessen heuen. And þerfore, *Drede ȝe god,* as I first *seide.* Þat we laste in loue drede to oure lyues ende, and passe to god in charite, in heuen blisse to dwelle, he graunte vs grace þat for monkynde dyede on goode friday. Amen.

B

Dominica sexta[1]

In nouitate vite ambulemus, Ad. ro. vito.[2] Crist in þe gospel þis day telleþ hou we schulden be riȝtwysse to god and to mon, to reule oure lyfe aftur his lawe, and saith on þis wyse, *Soþely I say vn to ow bote ȝef ȝoure riȝtwisnesse habounde more, þat is bote hit be more, þen is þe riȝtwisnesse of scribes and pharisees, ȝe schulen not entre in to þe kyndam of heuen.*[a] ȝe þat supposen þat þe comaundementes of þe olde lawe ben harder þen of þe newe lawe, þey mowen lerne to knowelache hire vncunnyngnesse, heryng crist oure sauyour seyng þuse wordes. Þe riȝtwisnesse of scribes and pharisees in þe holde lawe was no mon bodyly for to sle. Bote þe riȝtwisnesse of hem þat schulen to heuen wenden ys not only þat þey schulen sle no mon, bote also þat þey han no wraþþe ne hate to no mon. Hire riȝtwisnesse was also hire frendes for to loue and for to haten hire enemy. Bote oures mot passe þis, þat we louen not only oure frend [fol. 18b] yn god bote also oure enemy for þe loue of god. And so byddeþ crist hym self in þe gospel *vbi sic dicit,*[3] *Diligite inimicos vestros* &c.[b] Loueþ ȝoure enemyes, doþ good to hem þat hateþ ow, preieþ for hem þat nuyeth ow and pursueth ow. Also þe maundement of þe holde lawe is þat with hire neybores wyfe þey schulden doun noun lecherie. And god in þe newe lawe biddeþ þat we schulden not coueyte to doun hit in herte. Þe riȝtwisnesse of þe pharisees also was to reue no mon his þyng. And vs oweþ to ȝeue of oure þyng to hem þat han nede and not with cuntek to withstonden hem þat vs robben. And so oure lord byddeþ, seyng on þis wyse, *Amen, dico vobis non resistere malo. Et si quis*[4] *quod tuum est tulerit, non repetas.*[c] And þus hit scheweth þat oure maundementes ben streytur þen hiren.

---

[1]Sixth after Easter.

[2]MS, citation not underlined, though the text is.

[3]MS, phrase not underlined.

[4]MS, adds *'est.'*

And þus seyþ þe gospel forth in þe text, *ȝe han herd þat it was seide of olde, þou schalt not sle: soþely he þat sleþ, ys gulty þe dome. I say soþely to ow: he þat is wraþþed to his broþur, he is gulty* [*þe*] *dome: he þat seith to his broþer a reprefyng word, is gulty to counseyl; and he þat seiþ soþely 'fole' to his broþur, he schal be gulty to þe fuyr of helle. And þerfore ȝef þou offre þi ȝyfte vn to þe auter, and þer hast muynde þat þy broþur any þyng hath aȝeynes þe: lef þer þy ȝifte byfore þe auter, and go, first to be recounsiled to þi broþur: and penne comyng ofre þy ȝifte to þe auter.*[d] In þuse þre synnes arn þre degrees of peynes ordeyned for þuse synnes to punische hem whit al. To hym þat wraþþed hym with his broþur is ordeyned peyne of dome for þat he holdeþ þis wraþþe in his herte. For al þough he be gulty to þe dome, ȝet may he by grace haue sum defence. Bote he þat with strif repreueth his broþur, he scheweþ out in word þe wrathe of his herte, and so as for þe more synne, to counseyle he is gulty. And þat is harder dom, whenne domesmen comen to gedur, to deme wat peyne is ordeyned to hym for his mysdede. Bote þe peyne of helle is aller hardest dome, þat is ordeyned to hem þat callen hire broþur foole, seþen god hath ȝeuen hem wysdome þorw his oune goodnesse. And so þe goodnesse of þe holy gost suche men dispisen. And so ben þuse þre diuerse dwellyng stedes in euer lastyng dampnacoun for þuse diuerse synnes. And þerfore ȝef þi broþur haue ouȝt aȝeynes þe to whom þou hast trespacyd in word or in dede, wend to hym with a meke herte, amendes for to make. And so do þou þe same to hem þat anoyden þ. When þey aske þe mercy, frely hem forȝeue. And wend þenne in cherite þyn [fol. 19a] offeryng to make. But ȝif þou be not fully in charyte, as þe owe, bere noghte[5] aweye þi ȝifte and so leue þin offeryng, but leeue þin offeryng at þe churche til ȝee ben acorded. And so þi gode purpos þou schalt fulfulle in dede.

And þus to amende vs boþe to god and to mon, þat oure offeryng may be plesyng to [god], preye we vnto hym þat ful of mercy is, þat we þis day haue grace hys wordes ȝou to telle, and ȝee thurghe ȝoure hooly lyf to kepe hem in ȝoure soule, þat we may thurghe hem so oure lyf amende to wone wyth hym in hys blysse þat euere more schal laste. And þat hyt so be &c.

In nouitate vite ambulemus. . . .

Notes to Appendix

A

[a]As is usually true in this MS, the introductory sentence of the corresponding *Bodl. 788* Sunday-gospel sermon is omitted, but the readings which vary from those of the corresponding sermons become more frequent in this section of the cycle. *Supra*, note 30. The readings which vary from *Bodl. 788* are of five types: those caused by

[5]MS, '*aȝeyn*' with *punctum delens* under each letter.

(1) variation in word order, (2) the omission of words, (3) the addition of words, (4) the use of a synonymous word, and (5) such readings as:

'crist in diuerse tymes fro þat he roos to tyme of his ascencioun to coumforte hise disciples with syȝte of hem' for the *Bodl. 788*, *'Crist* and ofte tymes be confortid by him. And þat was fro rysynge of Crist to þe tyme þat he steye to hevene' (*Sel. Eng. Wks*, I, 141, 11. 18–19)

'aftur crist was rysen'—'aftir þe rysyng of Crist' (*ibid*, I, 142, 11. 2–3)

'for he com noht of his modur as oþer men comen in to þis world. By myracle was he boren of hure. And he ne brak not þe cloystre of hure bote'—'for whan he cam out of his modir he brak not þe cloister of hir, but' (*ibid.*, I, 142, 11. 29–30).

'or anoþer wondurful þing þe wuche his body is fed wit'—'or a lord, or þing of wounder, and þerwiþ fediþ his body' (*ibid*, I, 143, 15–16).

'is not contrarie'—'contrarieþ not' (*ibid*, 143, 21–22).

In this protheme, letters and words supplied in brackets are taken from the edited text of the Sunday-gospel sermons. This Sidney Sussex sermon was chosen because of its typical development of the epistle theme. The protheme, however, is not typical of the sermons in the *Bodl. 788* collection: it lacks Lollard doctrine, and it is the only gospel sermon which develops a fairly long anagogical discussion.

[b]II Cor., v. 10: *Omnes enim nos manifestari oportet ante tribunal Christi, ut referat unusquisque propria corporis prout gessit, siue bonum, siue malum.*

[c]Ps. xxxii, 8: *Timeat Dominum omnis terra: ab eo autem commoveantur omnes inhabitantes orbem.*

[d]I have been unable to find such a passage in the Vulgate; one is reminded of Prov., viii, 13 and xvi, 6. See also St. Bernard's *Sermo II. In Festo SS. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum* (Migne, CLXXXIII, clmn. 411), pt. 6.

[e]This does not vary from I Jo., iv, 18.

[f]The other two engines are faith and hope. This discussion is part of the elaborate figure spoken of in note 39, *supra*. The city is man's soul; the five gates of the city are the five wits; the walls, the flesh; the four towers of the city and the three engines protecting the city, the seven virtues; the ditch around the city, 'moder mekenesse'; the great stones cast by the engines, the deeds of mercy; the porters, 'wakernesse & bysynesse, discrecyoun & hardynesse, þe fyfte is perseueraunce.' However (and this happens more often than not throughout the cycle after the initial process of a division or the first brief designation of a figure has been given) this basic design is abandoned in the discussion of specific points. Thus, in the sermon for Passion Sunday, when the first engine, faith, is discussed, we learn that good deeds are the posts, the stone is God's word, the caster is the Christian man, Christ is the ground, and that the fourteen pins of the engine are the fourteen points of the creed. Instruction on the creed then follows throughout the rest of the sermon for Passion Sunday and throughout the next three sermons.

The 'bowes' here mentioned are, of course, taken from I Cor., xiii, 4–8. However, the order of the Vulgate, observed in the other Wyclyfite treatments of the subject is not observed here. The eighth and the ninth points: *non inritatur, non cogitat malum*, are transposed. Cf. *Sel.Eng.Wks.*, II, 266–8; *Engl.Wks.*, pp. 353–5.

[g]Ps., cxxxix, 4; Ro., iii, 13.
[h]Isa., i, 16–17.
[i]Ps., xiv, 1: *Domine quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo?*
[j]Iohn., iii, 20: *Omnis enim qui mala agit, odit lucem, et non uenit ad lucem, ut non arguantur opera eius.* The omission, of course, might have been caused by an eye-skip.
[k]Luc., xxii, 26 has . . . *qui maior est in uobis, fiat sicut iunior: et qui praecessor est, sicut ministrator.*
[l]The beginning of Matt., xxiii, 8 and of Matt., xxiii, 10.
[m]Hosea, iv, 8–9.
[n]A variation, which we might expect from a Lollard, of Ier. vi, 13: *A minore quippe usque ad maiorem omnes avaritiae student; et a propheta usque ad sacerdotum cuncti faciunt dolum.*
[o]Matt., xxiv, 12.

B

[a]This translation does not agree with either the Early or the Late Version of the Wyclyfite Bible; Matt., v, 20, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments . . . made by John Wycliffe and his followers.*, ed. Rev. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1850), IV.
[b]Matt., v, 44.
[c]Matt., v, 39: *Ego autem dico uobis, non resistere malo. Sed si quis te percusserit . . .* ; and Luc., vi, 30: . . . *et qui aufert quae tua sunt, ne repetas.*
[d]Here again the translation does not agree with either of the Wyclyfite Bible Versions; Matt., v, 21–24, *Wycliffe Bible*, IV.

A LOOKING GLASSE AND THE SCRIPTURES

BY ROBERT ADGER LAW

The purpose of this paper is to examine in some detail, with special reference to its borrowings from the Bible, Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene's drama, *A Looking Glasse for London and England,* which was published under their names in 1594. Such examination of the play may answer several questions that have not been solved by its recent editors. To the popularity of this drama in the latter days of the Elizabethan period strong evidence testifies, and during the present century it has had four reprintings and considerable discussion. It was twice entered for publication in the Stationers' Register: first, on March 5, 1593–4, by Creede; again, on August 14, 1600, by Pavyer.[1] Still extant are copies of a first edition, dated 1594; a second, dated 1598; a third of 1602; another of 1617; and still another, without date, recently acquired by the University of Chicago. Henslowe's Diary records four performances of *A Looking Glasse* between March 8, 1592, when it was not marked as a new play, and June 7 of the same year. Five passages from it are quoted in Robert Allot's anthology *England's Parnassus* (1600).[2] Modern texts of the play are available in Dyce's edition of Greene and Peele (1861), in Grosart's edition of Greene (1881–1888), in the Hunterian Club's edition of Greene (1905), in J. S. Farmer's facsimile of the play (1914), and in Greg's careful reprint for the Malone Society (1932). Any drama with such a record deserves the attention of scholars.

In order to make clear the detailed discussion to follow, it will be helpful to present a brief summary of the play's

---

[1]See Arber's *Transcript of the Stationers' Register* under dates given. Greg cities folios of the Register as Register B, fol. 305[a], and Register C, fol. 63[a,b].

[2]All these facts and other details are set forth in Dr. W. W. Greg's introduction to the Malone Society Reprint, 1932, pp. v-viii.

contents. The main plot centers about the story of Jonas as set forth in the Bible, but it has several subplots, each concerned with a separate group of individuals, introduced and largely carried forward in separate scenes. Evidently the authors in preparing for the repentance of the Ninivites [*sic*] desired to stress their wickedness by portraying in turn three sinful classes of that community. First of all, the Ninivite King, Rasni by name, enters "with three Kings of *Cilicia, Creete,* and *Paphlagonia,* from the ouerthrow of *Ieroboam,* King of *Ierusalem.*"[3] Despite protests, King Rasni lays plans to marry his own sister Remilia, but on the eve of her wedding she is destroyed by miraculous fire. The King then follows the advice of Radagon, a parasite courtier, to take for his own the wife of his friend, the King of Paphlagonia, who soon murders her husband by poison. Meanwhile the parasite Radagon, immediately after he has disowned his starving parents, is himself consumed by fire from heaven, and the Paphlagonian Queen makes love to another King, who is too wise to accept her. Such is the profligate court to which Ionas is sent to preach. Upon his exhortations, King and court repent in sackcloth and ashes.

The second group of Ninivites comprises an unnamed Smith, his wife, his apprentice Adam, and several roystering companions. These revelers drink to excess at a tavern, fight, slay one of their company, and then make light of the deed. Later, Adam steals his master's wife and beats up the master. Unlike the rest, Adam refuses to repent at the preaching of Ionas, choosing rather to be hanged than to fast five days, as the King has ordained.

The third group of citizens presented occupies a rank intermediate socially between Adam and the royal court. Chief of these are a Usurer and two of his customers, "a young Gentleman, and a poor man." These two customers the Usurer defrauds, and by bribing both the judge and and the lawyer for his victims, he tricks the Gentleman out of his lands and the poor man out of his cow. By the

[3]Throughout I am quoting the text of Greg's edition.

time Ionas arrives in Ninivie the two customers have turned professional thieves in the employ of the Usurer. On hearing Ionas all repent.

An additional element of the play, though hardly to be termed a subplot, concerns the prophet Oseas. Brought in by an Angel, Oseas points the moral after each new exhibition of wickedness. But when Ionas arrives in Ninivie, Oseas is carried away by the Angel and so removed from the play. In all the action Oseas remains a spectator, never coming into real contact with any of the other groups.

The drama contains twenty scenes all told, and the story of Ionas begins only in Scene viii. This plot follows closely the details of the Biblical narrative except for a somewhat surprising conclusion. God gives command to Ionas to preach repentance to the Ninivites, but the prophet disobeys, taking ship for Tharsus. A storm comes up, the sailors cast lots, and when the lot falls on Ionas and he has confessed his sin, they throw him into the sea. A whale swallows him but later spews him out on land, after which escape Ionas gives thanks to God for preserving his life. He then obeys the divine command to preach repentance with threat of destruction to Ninivie, but is greatly disappointed when the Lord spares the city because of the repentance of King Rasni and his people. Outside Ninivie he sits under the shade of a gourd vine, but a serpent destroys the vine, thus making Ionas the more angry. On receiving further explanation from the Lord, Ionas himself repents, and joins in the general rejoicing. But he adds a warning to London to cease from her sins lest she suffer the destruction promised to Ninivie.

"Though affected by its moral configuration," says Gayley, "the *Looking Glasse* is well constructed."[4] Gayley refers particularly to characterization in the drama, but his remark applies equally to the plot-structure as a whole.

---

[4]C. M. Gayley: *Representative English Comedies.* From the beginnings to Shakespeare. New York: The Macmillan Company (1904), p. 407.

The entire play has to do with one group of ideas: the Ninivites' sins, their general repentance, and their forgiveness. All the action except that of two scenes, which are drawn directly from the Bible, takes place within the city of Ninivie or close to it, and the time covered is only a few days. While the play as originally printed is not divided into acts, yet its scenes consistently develop the central idea, and the story closes at practically the same point as the Scriptural narrative, on the day Ninivie was to be destroyed.

From this somewhat tedious explanatory introduction it becomes obvious that the play, generally classified as a morality, is essentially a miracle play in its recountal of all the incidents related in a single book of the Bible, with slight variations and numerous additions by the two Elizabethan playwrights. But so far as I know, no one has yet attempted through investigation to reveal the direct source of Lodge and Greene, nor by comparison with this source to clear away some of the difficulties that the text presents. We know that the *Looking Glasse* was on the stage by 1592 and in print by 1594. The immediate source for the Ionas scenes could not, then, have been the Authorized (King James) Version of the Bible (1609–11), but might have been either the Vulgate, the Geneva or Breeches Bible (1560), popular among the Puritans, or the Bishops' Bible (1568, 1572, 1585), used in the Church of England. Does the text of the play, one may ask, give evidence as to the source? Again, is the Bible the source of any part of the text aside from the Ionas scenes? Furthermore, which of the two authors is the more likely to have been responsible for the Biblical story? Finally, since the *Looking Glasse* has been shown to have certain close relations with Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus,* do its echoes from Holy Writ indicate in any way whether Lodge and Greene borrowed from *Faustus,* or Marlowe drew lines from *A Looking Glasse?* Each question will be considered in turn.

Differences in wording between the two English versions of the Bible are very slight, but that the authors of

A Looking Glasse have followed an English rendering the words and their order make quite clear. For example, lines 1419, 1420 of the play read:

> Who answered vs, I am an Hebrue borne,
> Who feare the Lord of heauen who made the sea.

Compare the Bishops' Bible at the corresponding point, *Ionas*, I.9:

> And he answered them, I am an Hebrue, and I feare the Lord God of heauen, which hath made the sea. . . .

Except for slight differences in spelling the Geneva Version reads the same.

Line 1423 of the play:

> Take me and cast my carkasse in the sea.

Correspondingly, Bishops' Bible, I.12:

> Take me, and cast me into the sea.

The Geneva Version contains the same words.

Again, for a slightly longer passage, see *A Looking Glasse*, ll. 1477–85:

> In trouble Lord I called vnto thee,
> Out of the belly of the deepest hell,
> I cride, and thou didst heare my voice O God:
> Tis thou hadst cast me downe into the deepe,
> The seas and flouds did compasse me about,
> I thought I had bene cast from out thy sight,
> The weeds were wrapt about my wretched head,
> I went vnto the bottome of the hilles,
> But thou O Lord my God hast brought me vp.

The corresponding lines from the Bishops' Bible, *Ionas*, II.2–6:

> In affliction I cried vnto the Lord, and he heard me: out of the belly of hel cried I, and thou heardest my voyce. Thou hadst cast mee downe into the deepe, into the middest of the sea, & the floods compassed me about: all thy billowes and waues passed ouer me. And I said, I am cast away out of thy sight. . . . The weedes were

wrapt about my hed. I went downe to ye bottome of ye mountains, . . . yet hast ye brought vp my life from corruption, O Lord my God.[5]

The wording of this passage in the Geneva Bible differs very slightly, but these differences may be significant. The almost exact repetition of the English Biblical language makes certain, in my opinion, the authors' dependence on one of the two available English versions, for a literal translation of the Latin Vulgate would not show the same close wording.

Where, then, *A Looking Glasse* has "thou hadst cast me downe into the deepe," and the Bishops' Bible reading is identical, the Geneva Bible has "Thou hadst cast me downe into the bottom." *A Looking Glasse* reads, "In trouble, Lord, I called vnto thee," and the Bishops' Bible employs the like syntax, "In affliction, I cried vnto the Lord," but the Geneva sentence is "I cried in my affliction unto the Lord."

Comparing other passages with a slight difference between the two versions, we find in *A Looking Glasse,* l. 2205, "On which thou never labor didst bestow'"; Bishops' Bible, *Ionas* IV.10: "About the which thou bestowedst no labour"; Geneva Version, *ibid.,* "For the which thou hadst not laboured." *A Looking Glasse,* l. 2183: "Full of compassion and of sufferance"; Bishops' Bible, IV.2: "Mercifull, long suffering"; Geneva Version: "Mercifull, slow to anger."

I have not noted such close parallels at any point between the Geneva Bible and the play except where a similarly close parallel exists with the Bishops' Bible.

---

[5]I am following consistently the text of the 1585 edition of the Bishops' Bible from a photostat of certain pages furnished by the New York Public Library. Earlier editions that I have examined seem to differ occasionally in spelling but not in wording. With the first two sentences compare the reading of the Vulgate text: "Clamavi de tribulatione mea ad Dominum, et exaudivit me; de ventre inferi clamavi, et exaudisti vocem meam. Et projecisti me in profundum in corde maris, et flumen circumdedit me; omnes gurgites tui et fluctus tui super me transierunt. Et ego dixi: Abjectus sum a conspectu oculorum tuorum."

Now let us compare the marginal glosses of the two translations to see if they throw light on the problem. In two cases the playwrights might be following marginal notes from either of the two English versions. The nineteenth line of the play tells us that Ninivie possesses

> Six hundreth Towers that toplesse touch the cloudes.

Line 1499, however, makes the number three hundred towers. Now neither of these figures is quite consistent with a marginal note on the first page of the *Book of Ionas* in the Bishops' Bible, where Ninivie is said to have had "in number an hundred and fifty Towres." The margin of the Geneva Bible increases it to "a thousand and five hundred towres." So the many towers of Ninivie are always stressed, but the source of the number given in the play is not clear.

Again, line 1041 of *A Looking Glasse* contains the phrase "here in Ioppa haven." The margin of the Bishops' Bible informs us that Ioppa "is an hauen towne in the which Peter lodged." Likewise the Geneva Version states that Iapho "was the haven and porte to take shipping thither, called also Ioppa."

But in the Geneva Bible I find no mention of Cilicia, the King of which country is a more or less prominent figure throughout the Rasni scenes of the play. The name was possibly suggested by a marginal note on the opening page of *Ionas* in the Bishops' Bible, wherein we learn that Tharsis "is the name of a place likely to be Cilicia, for there was a great citie of that name where also Paul was borne."

Most important of all for our purposes is the gloss on the name Lycus. In lines 12–13 of the play King Rasni proudly asks:

> Am I not he that rules great *Niniuie*,
> Rounded with *Lycas* siluer flowing streams?

Later, in lines 1497–8, Ionas, exclaims on seeing Ninivie:

> Behold sweete *Licas* streaming in his boundes,
> Bearing the walles of haughtie *Niniuie*.

Now Churton Collins' note on the first of these passages is interesting. He observes (*Plays and Poems of Greene*, I.290):

> "*Lycus:* many Asiatic rivers bore the name of Lycus, but none of them bounded or could bound Nineveh. Greene has evidently confounded the Lycus with the Tigris, on the left bank of which Nineveh is said to have been situated."

Apparently Collins had never read the marginal gloss opposite the first verses of the *Book of Ionas* in the Bishops' Bible, which states that Ninivie is "the greatest citie of the Assyrians, situate by y^{e} riuer Lycus as Strabo writeth." No such note is on the corresponding page of the Geneva Bible, nor have I found in it any mention of Lycus.

Thus, both the wording and the glosses of the Bishops' Bible point to the use of that version rather than any other by Lodge and Greene for details of the Ionas story.

But the strongest testimony is offered by the form of the proper names. *The Looking Glasse* has forms corresponding to the two versions as is seen in the following table:

Looking Glasse	Bishops' Bible	Geneva Bible
Ionas	Ionas	Ionah
Ninivie	Ninive	Niniveh
Ioppa	Ioppa	Iapho
Tharsus	Tharsis	Tarshish
Hebrue	Hebrue	Ebrew

This evidence, then, confirms that already drawn from the wording and the glosses that the Bishops' Bible is the immediate source of the Ionas scenes.

Closeness of the wording of the play to that of the *Book of Ionas* suggests that the author of these scenes wrote with the Bible open before him. But this does not tell the whole story. Careful comparison of the play with the Biblical text shows hardly a single verse in the entire four chapters of the *Book of Ionas* that has not been worked into the play, most of these verses in the same succession as in the original. Another table may bring this out:

Book of Ionas		*Looking Glasse*
Chapter I. Verse	1	Line 975
	2	979–981
	3	1005–6, 1041, 1046
	4	1386–7
	5	1403–6, 1408–10
	6	1411–13
	7	1414–16
	8	1418
	9	1419–21
	10	1421
	11	-------
	12	1423–4
	13	1427
	14	-------
	15	1428–9
	16	1441–2
Chap. II.	1	1497
	2	1477–9
	3	1480–1
	4	1482
	5	1483
	6	1484–5
	7	1486–7
	8	----------
	9	1488–9
	10	1460–1 (s.d.)
Chap. III.	1	1490 (s.d.)
	2	1491–2
	3	14, 15
	4	1794–6
	5	1797–1800
	6	2022–3
	7	2018–20
	8	2020
	9	2021
	10	2216–7
Chap. IV.	1	2175–7
	2	2178–84
	3	2185
	4	2194
	5	2171–4
	6	2173–4
	7	2187–90
	8	2191–2201
	9	2202–3
	10	2204–7
	11	2208–12

Nor does Biblical influence cease with the Ionas scenes. Many lines in other portions of the play strongly echo verses from the New Testament or the Old. Oversight or neglect of this fact has led editors of the play into quite serious pitfalls.

For example, there has been much discussion of lines 2000–1 of *A Looking Glasse,* which read:

> Thine eldest sister is *Lamana*
> And *Sodome* on thy right hand seated is.

Now the word *Lamana* is unintelligible, and has, ever since Dyce first edited the play, been regarded as a corruption. Dyce had no improvement to suggest, but Grosart proposed *Gomorrah,* Deighton *El Adama,* and J. C. Smith *Samaria.* Collins (*Plays and Poems,* I, 302) pronounces *Samaria* an "almost certain conjecture," and cites several passages from *Hosea* and *Ezekiel* in proof. Apparently, however, no one has yet noted in this connection the wording of *Ezekiel,* XVI, 46 (Bishops' Bible):

> Thyne eldest sister is Samaria, she and her daughters that dwel vpon thy left hand, but thy younger sister, that dwelleth on thy right hand, is Sodoma & her daughters.

Another apparently unnoticed echo of the Scriptures occurs in lines 2349–50, where Ionas hails the legitimate betrothal of King Rasni to Alvida in the words:

> Like Oliue branches let your children spred:
> And as the Pines in loftie *Libanon.*

Compare again the Bishops' Bible, *Osea,* XIV, 6:

> His branches shall spreade out abroade and be as fayre as the olive tree; and smelle as Libanus.

Yet another echo is from the *Book of Psalms.* Oseas asserts in line 173:

> The Lord lookes downe, and cannot see one good.

Compare *Psalms,* XIV, 2–3 (Bishops' Bible):

> God looked down from heauen vpon the children of menne to see if there were any that did understand and seeke after God. . . . There is none that dooth good, no not one.

Without further direct quotation I may say that Ionas in telling of "the proud Leviathan that scours the seas," appears to echo the familiar account of Leviathan in *Job;*

that when the Usurer repents, he falls into the language of Zaccheus, the penitent Publican of the Gospel of *Saint Luke;* that other allusions are to Balaam and his ass that spoke, to Sodom and Gomorrah, to Mount Carmel, to the Sermon on the Mount, and to the Last Judgment.[6]

Oversight of one such Biblical echo has led even Dr. W. W. Greg into seemingly a curious error. He states in his introduction to the Malone Society reprint of the play (p. xxviii), in commenting on corruptions of the text, that the Smith "addresses the Clown as Peter, whereas the Clown's name is, of course, Adam." Now what Dr. Greg has assumed to be a slip on the author's part is, I believe, the quotation of a familiar verse from one of the gospels. The Clown in the play exclaims to Adam, l. 223: "O *Peter, Peter,* put up thy sword heartily into thy scabbard." The Gospel of *St. John,* XVIII, 11, reads: "Therefore sayd Jesus vnto Peter, Put vp thy swoorde into the sheath," or "scabbard," as the Douai Version has it. I have long thought that Shakespeare has in mind the same verse where a real Peter in *Romeo and Juliet,* IV.v.123, is told, "Put up your dagger and put out your wit."

All these verbal echoes and other Biblical allusions testify to an unusual verbal memory of various passages of the Bible and a close following of its phraseology. Just what does this signify as to the composition of the play? Does it solve any problems as to the collaborative authorship?

In Thomas Lodge's prose pamphlet, "A Nettle for Nice Noses," I find the following Biblical echoes:

> Euill shepheards take no heed of their sheepe, & hired men if they see the Wolfe charging the flocke, they suddenly flie.[7]

---

[6] A considerable number of such allusions are listed in an unpublished Master's thesis written about this play by one of my former pupils, Miss Margaret Cotham, and now deposited in The University of Texas Library. The quotations given above are not in the thesis.

[7] *Works of Lodge,* Hunterian Club Edition, III, 17. Compare *John,* X, 12.

Pull the beam out of thine owne eye, then help thy brother.[8]

Mark what the Psalmist saith, Lord, who shall dwell in thy Tabernacle, who shall rest upon thy holy hill? He that hath not giuen his money to vsurie.[9]

For our Saviour saith, *Mat.* 7, All things that you will other men do vnto you, do you the same vnto them.[10]

There are also allusions to the *Apocalypse*, to *Oseas*, to *Ecclesiastes*, to Salomon, to Ezechiel, and to Saint Iames.

In the *Alarum to Usurers*, within a few pages (Lodge's *Works*, I. 21–8), verses from the *Proverbs* are echoed three times:

Sonne, sonne, giue ear to thy Fathers instructions, and ground them in thy heart, so shalt thou bee blessed among the elders, and be an eye sore unto thy enimies.

A harlots house is the gate of hell.

It is better to have the stripes of a friend, then the kisses of a flatterer.[10a]

Examples of this kind might be multiplied from Lodge's other pamphlets, but one other sentence is especially significant:

For example we have *Niniuie* which for sinne was threatened with distruction within fortie daies: and for repentance dismissed from the hand of displeasure (*Diuell Coniured*, *Works*, III. 45).

Now, Robert Greene had some knowledge of the Bible, but we do not find in his works the verbal repetition of Biblical passages that is here so prominent. Hence, I would attribute to Lodge's authorship, in addition to the Usurer scenes already assigned to him by common consent, all those parts of the play having to do with Ionas and also the speeches of Oseas. Greene, I think, wrote the humorous story of the boasting and unrepentant Smith Adam

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 10. Compare *Matthew*, VII, 5.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 35. Compare *Psalms* XV, 1, 5.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[10a] With the first sentence (p. 21) compare *Proverbs* I, 8–9; with the second (p. 22) compare *ibid.*, VII, 27; with the third, *ibid.*, XXVII, 7.

and probably planned the play as a whole, for the structure is close akin to that of Greene's *Friar Bacon.* One suspects that it is Greene who, in the opening stage direction, makes Ieroboam King of Ierusalem, instead of Israel or Ephraim, and has Ierusalem conquered by the King of Ninivie. Greene's historical geography is ever a thing of wonder, as exemplified by his assembling in *Orlando Furioso,* not only the Twelve Peers of France, but also the King of Cuba, the King of Mexico, and the Emperor of Africa.

The date of composition of *A Looking Glasse* cannot be determined until we are sure of the date of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus,* and also of the relation of Greene and Lodge's play to Marlowe's great tragedy. If *Dr. Faustus* was, as Boas believes, and as Tucker Brooke apparently once believed, among the last of Marlowe's plays, written in 1592 or close to that year, then undoubtedly the *Looking Glasse* is the source of certain passages in *Dr. Faustus.* For Greene died in 1592, and this was not his last play. But if *Dr. Faustus* preceded the *Looking Glasse* and was composed about 1588 or 1589, as most scholars who have expressed themselves think, then *A Looking Glasse* belongs to 1589 or thereabouts and is probably a later play than Greene's *Orlando Furioso,* though earlier than his *Friar Bacon* or *James the Fourth,* both written in 1590 or soon afterwards. On general grounds, we should be inclined to place among Marlowe's early writings *Dr. Faustus,* one of the most imaginative and romantic of the poet's works, and to name for his latest tragedies *Edward the Second* and *The Massacre at Paris,* two notable exemplars of realistic history.

The fullest and most satisfactory discussion of the relation between *Dr. Faustus* and *A Looking Glasse* is that in the recent volume, *Thomas Lodge: The History of an Elizabethan,* by N. B. Paradise. Declaring that "the similarities between these two plays are so close that they indicate

a direct relation between them,"[11] Paradise first cites five close verbal parallels, the first of which is

> From *Dr. Faustus:* And burnt the toplesse Towres of Ilium;
> From *A Looking Glasse:* Six hundreth Towers that toplesse touch the cloudes.

Noting that two of the other parallels cited are drawn from the repenting Faustus scenes in Marlowe and the repenting Usurer scenes in Lodge and Greene, Paradise quotes Collins's statement that "the germ of these scenes is to be found in Lodge's *Alarum against Usurers,*" although the *Looking Glasse* scene is "a reminiscence of the famous scene" in Marlowe. This theory Paradise rightly terms "improbable" in making Marlowe dramatize a passage from Lodge's pamphlet, and then having Lodge, in turn, borrow "his blank-verse version of the very passage."

Unquestionably the contention of Collins is improbable, but not merely for the reason assigned by Paradise. Rosenblances between Lodge's *Alarum* and Marlowe's *Faustus* arise from the use by both authors of a common source, the description of Doomsday in the *Revelations.* We are told there that all men "hydde themselves in the dennes and in the rocks of the hylles: And said to the hilles and rockes, Falle on vs, and hyde vs from the face of hym that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the lamme" (*Revelations,* VI, 15–16).

Lodge's *Alarum,* quoted by Collins, reads:

> . . . in this horror and confusion you shall desire the mountains to fall vpon you, and the hils to couer you from the fearfull indignation of the Lord of hostes, and the dredfull condemnation of the Lambe Iesus. *Works* I. 51.)

Marlowe puts it:

> And see where God
> Stretcheth out his arme, and bends his irefull browes;
> Mountaines and hills, come, come, and fall on me,
> And hide me from the heauy wrath of God.

---

[11]New Haven: Yale University Press (1931), p. 147.

No, no.
Then will I headong runne into the earth;
Earth gape. O no, it wil not harbour me. (*Dr. Faustus*, ll.1436–42)

The *Looking Glasse* passage runs:

Hell gapes for me, heauen will not hold my soule.
You mountaines shroud me from the God of truth.
Mee-thinkes I see him sit to iudge the earth.
See how he blots me out of the booke of life.
Oh burthen more then *Atna* that I beare.
Couer me hilles, and shroude me from the Lord (ll. 2054–9).

Now the allusion to the gaping of Hell in the *Looking Glasse* may be derived from the gaping of Earth in Marlowe, but the blotting out of the Book of Life is not Marlowesque; it is Biblical. Much more in the passage comes straight from the *Revelations*. The two other passages seem to me to be derived from the same common source. The "wrath of the lamme" in the *Revelations* gives the echo "condemnation of the Lambe Iesus," in the *Alarum*, but "wrath of God," in Marlowe. Personally, I cannot see that *Dr. Faustus* owes the "germ" of the scene or anything else to the *Alarum*.

Nevertheless, evidence of a close relation between *Faustus* and *A Looking Glasse* still remains. To the five parallels that have convinced Paradise that "*A Looking Glasse* shows clearly the influence of Marlowe's plays, especially *Doctor Faustus*," I now wish to add one more. In this case the *Faustus* passage, like that of "the topless Towres of Ilium," is one of the most famous in Marlowe's play. Here Beelzebub denies that Hell is a fable and declares himself now in Hell, giving reasons for the statement. The parallel from *A Looking Glasse* is in an almost blasphemous speech of the parasite Radagon to King Rasni, whom he alsewhere addresses as "God on earth." To look on Rasni, then, would be to see God. The two passages follow:

A Looking Glasse, (ll. 1192–4):
Should I that looke on Rasnes countenance,
And march amidst his royal equipage
Embase my selfe to speake to such as they?

Doctor Faustus (Sc. iii, ll. 121–4):
Thinkst thou that I who saw the face of God,
And tasted the eternal joys of Heaven,
Am not tormented with ten thousand hells,
In being deprived of everlasting bliss?

The frequent occurrence of such similarity between passages in the two plays signifies, I believe, conscious imitation by Lodge and Greene of Marlowe's play, especially when there are faint echoes of notable *Faustus* passages. These are quite in harmony with the Biblical echoes already discussed. If the *Faustus* scene is not based on Lodge's prose pamphlet, as both Collins and Paradise mistakenly assumed, the case for *Faustus* as the later play is definitely weakened.

One argument put forward by Gayley, and apparently accepted by other critics who believe in an early date for *A Looking Glasse,* seems to me to carry little weight. This argument is the negative one of the absence in a play written near 1588 of allusion to the danger of the destruction of London by the Spanish Armada. Such failure to mention the threat of the Armada is taken to prove composition some years earlier than 1588. But the one theme of the play is the ungodliness and moral depravity of both Ninivie and London. If *A Looking Glasse* was written, as I believe, after 1588, mention of the Armada would have defeated its very aim. For the destruction of the Spanish fleet was evidence to Londoners of special favor to them in the eyes of the Almighty. Absence of such mention may argue for later composition.[12]

The chief conclusions reached by this investigation may, I think, be stated very briefly:

---

[12]I am not forgetting that a later date for the play involves other problems, such as Lodge's absence from England on his voyage to the Canaries, and the date of Greene's *Orlando Furioso.* Paradise gives reasons for dating the voyage to the Canaries no later than 1585. I have long thought that *Orlando* must have preceded *A Looking Glasse.* Perhaps I shall return to the subject of the chronology of all Greene's dramas in a later article.

(1) The immediate source of the main plot, particularly the Ionas scenes, is the Bishops' Bible.

(2) The probable author of numerous passages that show marked Biblical color in their phrasing, including the Ionas story, is Thomas Lodge.

(3) The evidently close relationship between *A Looking Glasse* and *Doctor Faustus* is more readily explained by regarding Marlowe as a source rather than as a borrower.

(4) In that case we must date *Doctor Faustus* nearer 1588 than 1592.

A secondary conclusion might be a warning against neglect of early versions of the English Bible by students of Elizabethan literature.

DIVINITY IN SPENSER'S GARDEN OF ADONIS

By Thomas P. Harrison, Jr.

No passage in Spenser has received more close attention than the Garden of Adonis in the *Faerie Queene* (3.6.29–50), for there is universal recognition of its beauty and its importance.[1] There is general agreement that this episode presents a consistent and unified whole, that apparent contradictions are reconciled in a larger harmony, that from beginning to end Spenser's purpose and method are deliberate. The supreme element in this harmony, however, is comprised in the final stanzas (43–50), which describe a stately mountain. This has received too scant attention and its significance has passed unrecognized. The setting here, explicitly described as separate from the lower garden, has never been so regarded; on the contrary, it has been accepted, with various efforts to reconcile obvious distinctions made by the poet, only as topographical irregularity in the garden landscape.[2] After

---

[1]For complete bibliographical summaries see the *Variorum Faerie Queene: Book Three*, Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Recent studies are those by Denis Saurat, *Literature and the Occult Tradition*, tr. Dorothy Bolton (London, 1930), "The Philosophical Ideas of Edmund Spenser," pp. 163–200; Mrs. Josephine W. Bennett, "Spenser's Garden of Adonis," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 46–80; and Brents Stirling, "The Philosophy in Spenser's Garden of Adonis," *PMLA*, XLIX (1934), 501–538.

[2]The poet "seems to have forgotten what went before," Saurat writes (*op. cit.*, p. 195). "We could accept this anywhere else in *The Faerie Queene* where such retreats are not rare, but in the middle of this allegorical garden, where there is no enemy but time, these features should not have been brought in. . . . If there is so little coherence in the description, we must not expect to find it in the ideas either." Mrs. Bennett points out (*op. cit.*, 49) that "Spenser is following tradition when he connects his garden with a mountain top," and though she dubiously admits (51) that "Spenser's 'mount' is certainly the seat of a paradise outside of the material world where souls sojourn between incarnations," she joins all other critics in

the naturalistic theme of the garden has been concluded, Spenser describes a mountain paradise inhabited not only by Venus, Adonis, Cupid, Psyche, and Pleasure but by the souls of all "sad lovers transformde of yore." By bringing together in a brief compass the three traditions in which the Adonis myth shares—naturalism, metamorphosis, and paradise—the poet not only repeats the major theme but he introduces the complementary motif—that of divinity. To this new motif Spenser gives a kind of specific designation, as he includes in this celestial company the soul of Sir Philip Sidney, whom twice he has celebrated in terms of the Adonis myth. Spenser's mountain thus gains a valid interest equally with the fragmentary eighth canto of "Mutabilitie," with which it is clearly analogous as a chapter in Spenser's philosophical thinking.

Examination of these proposals requires, first, a brief review of the Adonis myth as it reached Spenser by way of Ovid, the popular handbooks, and the Virgilian pastoral; and next, a study of the Sidney elegies—the *Ruines of Time* and *Astrophel.* These poems are both closely linked with the myth and have a direct bearing upon the special allegory of the mount. One is then in position to understand Spenser's mountain and to perceive its relationship with the lower garden. It is hoped that, while modifying certain aspects of the extensive investigation of the episode, the present study will remove some of the remaining difficulties.

I. The Adonis Myth

The voluptuous narrative of Venus' love for Adonis, his death in the boar hunt, Venus' grief over his body, and his metamorphosis into a flower, became a Renaissance

---

recognizing no distinction between garden and mount. The "heavenly features" of Spenser's mount, she states (78), serve to "keep the other-world nature of the garden from being forgotten." Stirling, *op. cit.*, 537, describes the mountain episode only as "a charming repetition" of the garden.

favorite, Ovid's extensive treatment in the *Metamorphoses* (10.519 ff.) supplementing Bion's *The Lament for Adonis.* With Ovid as chief guide Spenser once versified this story for ornamental effect, when he described a tapestry (*F. Q.* 3.1.34–38). In the naturalistic Garden of Adonis there would seem to be little room for Ovid's narrative, though earlier books of the *Metamorphoses* contributed substantially.[3] But the extent to which Ovid's incestuous tale of Cinyras and Myrrha colored the imagery of the Garden and of the adjacent passages has not been fully noticed, for Spenser was intimately familiar with the tragic story of the parents of Adonis.[4]

Yet the Garden of Adonis is essentially naturalistic, and is, hence, to be understood in reference to earlier forms of the myth, which in Ovid is superficially treated. For the Adonis story originated in the nature worship of primitive peoples who mourned the coming of summer with its destruction of vegetation. At the hands of the

---

[3]W. P. Cumming, "Ovid as a Source for Spenser's Monster-Spawning Mud Passages," *MLN*, XLV (1930), 166–168. Stirling, *op. cit.*, 510 ff., indicates the importance of Golding's translation.

[4]Direct allusions to the flight of Myrrha (cf. especially *F.Q.* 3.7.26) are noted by H. G. Lotspeich, *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*, Princeton University Press, 1932, p. 86. Spenser "may have known Ovid's account," he states. Space prevents elaboration of the following parallels which seem to confirm Spenser's knowledge of Ovid's story directly or through Golding. With the flight and wandering of Myrrha (*Met.* 10.476–481) cf. those of Chrysogonee (*F.Q.* 3.6.10). With the birth of Adonis (*Met.* 10.505–513) cf. that of the twins Amoret and Belphoebe (*F.Q.* 3.6.27). These, immaculately conceived, are balanced by their counterparts, the giants Ollyphant and Argante, who like Adonis are incestuously conceived by drunken sires (*Met.* 10.438 and *F.Q.* 3.7.47). Foresaking Cytheron, Paphos, and Cnidos, Venus loves and fosters Adonis (*Met.* 10.529–536) as in Spenser this goddess discovers and adopts Amoret, whom she brings to the Garden of Adonis, which is associated with these same three seats of worship (*F.Q.* 3.6. 28–29). Finally, Ovid's description of the myrrh tree (the metamorphosed Myrrha) from which fall drops of gum (*Met.* 10.499–502) seems to be reflected in the description of the "grove of mirtle trees" on Spenser's mount (*F.Q.* 3.6.43).

Greeks this sadness over the fading life of earth took the form of a dirge over the death of an ideal shepherd youth —singer, lover, hunter, favorite of gods and men. To this youth mythology gave various names: Daphnis, Orpheus, Hylas, Hyacinthus, Narcissus, Linus, Adonis. The name Linus, or Ailinus, derives from *ai lanu* (woe to us), which formed the burden of the lament for Adonis and similar dirges in the East; and the name Adonis itself is a misnomer, coming from the Semitic *Adon* (lord) by which the deity Tammuz was worshipped in Egypt and western Asia.[5] Hence it may be understood that in linking with Adonis the names of Hyacinthus and Narcissus (*F. Q.* 3.6.45) Spenser recalled the common connection of all three with the original myth.

Naturalistic interpretations of mythology were common knowledge during the Renaissance. In Natalis Comes, for example, whom obviously Spenser knew,[6] the Adonis myth is fully set forth with liberal quotations from Bion and Ovid. Adonis stands for the sun, or by extension of meaning, the generative principle of all life, the author and nourisher of seeds, the formative agent in creation. Venus is the fruitful Earth-mother, recipient substance, who from the embraces of her lover produces the infinite new life of earth. The boar, fatal enemy of Adonis, represents the winter season. Moreover, at first or second hand, Spenser was acquainted with other authority which retained at least vestiges of earlier naturalism. In Theocritus' Idyl 15, "The Alexandrian Women," and in Bion's *Lament,* Adonis, the embodiment of the transient life of nature, is annually mourned as widowed Venus relinquishes him to Persephone for the desolate, unfruitful months. But with the return of spring Adonis would come again, again join his divine mistress. So end the dirges with the note of hope and joy in the thought of return. Little pots filled with quick-growing plants, mentioned by

---

[5]Cf. further *The Pastoral Elegy: An Anthology,* ed. Thomas P. Harrison, Jr., The University of Texas Press, 1939, pp. 1 ff.

[6]See Lotspeich, *op. cit.,* especially pp. 32–33.

Theocritus (15.113), are symbolic of earlier forms of this festival, which was first a religious one.[7] So much, then, for the naturalistic aspects of the myth.

Mrs. Bennett has ably shown that the Garden of Adonis became in time identified with the tradition of the earthly paradise, as generalized conceptions of Eden, the Elysian fields, the Christian heaven, and even ideas about the Golden Age came to be merged.[8] And Lotspeich adds that Comes "speaks of places associated with the worship of Adonis 'in which seeds were sown and where there were many fruit-bearing trees, which were called Gardens of Adonis, because Adonis delighted in such places.' "[9] But the tradition of Virgil is peculiarly necessary to explain Spenser's symbolic mountain paradise where Adonis and his traditional partners live with the gods. This influence, it now appears, has a special relevance in the poet's train of thought.

It is well known that Virgil first established the consolation in pastoral elegy as a separate adjunct, the latter half of this tribute to Julius Caesar (Eclogue 5) being devoted to the joy of man and nature in his deification. Less widely recognized is the fact that this innovation represents merely an expansion of the hopeful motif in Theocritus and Bion, that, in other words, it derives from the Adonis myth. Throughout this poem, as Professor Rand observes,[10] "Virgil is mingling the legends of Daphnis and Adonis in the interests of a purpose different from either." But, as concerns Spenser's use of the Adonis myth, the significance of this point appears in connection with less conspicuous accretions which were to share the Virgilian tradition. In the famous fourth eclogue, with

---

[7]In these "gardens" perhaps originated the name for the later Garden of Adonis, which in Pliny and others became identified with the paradise tradition (see Bennett, *op. cit.*, 69–70).

[8]*Ibid.*, 46–51.

[9]*Op. cit.*, p. 33.

[10]E. K. Rand, *The Magical Art of Virgil*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1931, p. 92.

its associations with the Golden Age, Orpheus and Linus are introduced as famous singers (55–57); in the tenth, the tribute to Gallus, Adonis is extolled as the poet-shepherd (18); and finally, in the sixth, Gallus the poet is again extravagantly praised as he joins Linus and the Muses (64–71). In addition to such recollections Spenser was familiar, too, with the description of Elysium in the *Aeneid* (6.637 ff.); together, it now appears, they formed an important element in his poetic conceptions of paradise which, reflected in his early verse about Sidney, are all introduced in the final passage of the Garden of Adonis. The manner in which the myth, itself originally naturalistic, provides the divine motif becomes clear after a review of the Sidney elegies.

II. The Sidney Elegies

Spenser's *Ruines of Time* includes a long passage (281–343) of belated tribute to Sir Philip Sidney.[11] Platonism and Virgilian allusion predominate in the following lines describing the soul of Sidney, who, like Gallus, is the poet-shepherd (288 ff.):

> His blessed spirite, full of power divine . . .
> Fled backe too soone unto his native place . . .
> Whiles thou now in Elisian fields so free,
> With Orpheus, and with Linus, and the choice
> Of all that ever did in rimes rejoyce,
> Conversest, and doost heare their heavenlie layes,
> And they heare thine, and thine doo better praise.[12]

This is recognizable as a paradise of lovers elaborated also in the first hymn (280 ff.) and in *F. Q.*, Book Four

---

[11]This poem was written in 1590, when the first three books of *F.Q.* were issued. Although *Astrophel*, the second elegy, did not appear until 1595, it may well have been written earlier. Probably all three poems—the *Ruines*, *Astrophel*, and Book Three—are not far apart in date of composition. Cf. W. L. Renwick, ed. *Complaints* (London, 1928, p. 190) and *Daphnaïda and Other Poems* (London, 1929, p. 171).

[12]Renwick, ed. *Complaints*, p. 196, cites *Aeneid*, 6.637–678, and Eclogue 4.55–57.

(10.23–27). Simply for the sake of harmony with the lower garden,[13] it would seem, Spenser adds the Ovidian metamorphoses[14] of the mythical lovers in their mountain paradise (*F. Q.* 3.6.45):

> And all about grew every sort of flowre,
> To which sad lovers were transformde of yore;
> Fresh Hyacinthus, Phoebus paramoure
> And dearest love,
> Foolish Narcisse, that likes the watry shore,
> Sad Amaranthus, made a flowre but late,
> Sad Amaranthus, in whose purple gore
> Me seemes I see Amintas wretched fate,
> To whom sweet poets verse hath given endlesse date.

Significantly, Amintas in this passage, as it is universally recognized, stands for Sir Philip Sidney.[15] The inclusion of Sidney would seem to indicate not only that Spenser was thinking of that poet; it suggests a connection between this passage and the elegy celebrating Sidney

---

[13]Observing no distinction between garden and mount, Mrs. Bennett, *op. cit.*, 57–58, suggests that the notion of souls growing like plants "seems to be related to a theory about the mystical trees of Life, and of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, which grew in the garden of Eden." In Pico's *Commento* on Benivieni, a source for the *Hymnes*, she finds that the garden of Jove contains Ideas that grow like trees. With the Platonists each world was a copy of the next one higher, "so that if a garden was a suitable symbol for the realm of the ideas, it was also suitable, and even inevitable, for any lower 'world.'" These flowers of Spenser are souls in a paradise which only as a garden is a replica of the lower garden. Resort here to the Platonists is hardly necessary. The original conception of a garden may owe something to Eden, to which Ovid is added when the poet turns to the mountain paradise.

[14]For story of Hyacinthus, cf. *Met.* 10.162 ff.; for that of Narcissus cf. *Met.* 3.402 ff. The two youths are linked in Ausonius, *Cupido Cruci Adfixus*, 1–15 (Mrs. Bennett, *ibid.*, 50). Amaranthus, "never fading," is a traditional symbol of immortality. Milton (*P.L.* 3.353 ff.) states that it flourished in Eden, but later was "to Heav'n remov'd where first it grew."

[15]See the *Variorum Faerie Queene: Book Three*, pp. 259–260. Upton and Todd recall the metamorphosis in *Astrophel*, but do not otherwise connect the poem with the Garden passage.

in the *Ruines of Time.* The clear implication that this paradise of metamorphosed youths is a paradise for human souls, is confirmed by the second elegy, now to be considered.

In *Astrophel* Spenser so adapts Ronsard's version of Bion[16] that the Adonis narrative applies to Sidney and his wife. The poem comprises a pastoral account of the courtship, Sir Philip's death in the Netherlands, Lady Sidney's grief, and the concluding metamorphosis. As even in the *Shepheardes Calendar,* one may observe here, too, faint reflections of naturalism in the habitual, perhaps unconscious, equation of Venus with external nature (25–27):

> Woods, hills, and rivers now are desolate,
> Sith he is gone the which them all did grace:
> And all the fields do waile their *widow state.*[17]

The concluding metamorphosis in the poem prevented the addition of the usual consolation, its vernal heaven contrasting with a desolate earth. To supply this motif Spenser wrote a separate poem which without title follows immediately, and this in the closing lines of *Astrophel* he gracefully attributes to the pen of the Countess of Pembroke. Verbal repetition of the Sidney passage from the

---

[16]See my article, "Spenser, Ronsard, and Bion," *MLN,* XLIX (1934), 139–145.

[17]Italics mine. A careful reading of the *Calender* shows that, unlike most of his contemporaries, Spenser usually avoids the pathetic fallacy, in which nature is represented as a conscious being reflecting and sympathizing with human feelings. He recognizes in nature only analogy, and rarely is he guilty of the customary absurdities. By adapting his themes to seasonably appropriate months, Spenser achieves a harmony of seasonal with human moods which virtually excludes the idea of nature's sentience. Nature provides analogy, as for example in "January," (19 ff.):

> Thou barrein ground, whome winters wrath hath wasted,
> Art made a myrrhour to behold my plight.

Spenser's habitually serious and truthful approach to natural phenomena, reminiscent as it is of the Adonis myth, usually transcends the commonplace. Cf. further the "November" elegy, where the background of nature devastated by winter presents vivid contrast to the vernal joys of heaven.

Ruines of Time provides final proof that this poem, known as the "Lay of Clorinda," is Spenser's.[18] The new elegy gives place briefly to pastoral conventionalities only as prelude to a Platonic heaven, to which the soul of Sir Philip has returned. The picture of this heaven discloses a significant analogue with both the mountain paradise and the "heavenly hous" of Venus, from which she descends in search of Cupid. This comparison is an initial step in the definition of Spenser's "stately mount" in the Garden of Adonis.

Spenser connects the "Lay" with the Adonis theme of the preceding *Astrophel* by an allusion to the fatal attack of the boar ("Lay," 85 ff.):

> There liveth he in everlasting blis, . . .
> Ne dreading harme from any foes of his,
> Ne fearing salvage beasts more crueltie.

Almost exact repetition of this appears in the *Faerie Queene* (3.6.48):

> There now he liveth in eternall blis. . . .
> (There now he lives in everlasting joy—*next stanza*)
> Ne feareth he henceforth that foe of his,
> Which with his cruell tuske him deadly cloyd.

The question of immortality,

> Ay me! can so divine a thing be dead?

is thus answered ("Lay," 67–72):

> Ah, no! it is not dead, ne can it die,
> But lives for aie in blisful Paradise:
> Where like a new-borne babe it soft doth lie,
> In bed of lillies wrapt in tender wise,
> And compast all about with roses sweet,
> And daintie violets from head to feet.

---

[18]For evidence of Spenser's authorship, cf. P. W. Long, "Spenseriana," *MLN*, XXXI (1916), 79–82; C. G. Osgood, "Doleful Lay of Clorinda," MLN, XXXV (1920), 90–96; my article, "Spenser and the Earlier Pastoral Elegy," *Texas Studies in English*, XIII (1933), 36–53; and H. D. Rix, "Spenser's Rhetoric and the 'Doleful Lay,'" *MLN*, LIII (1938), 261–265.

Adonis is similarly pictured (*F. Q.* 3.6.46):

> There yet, some say, in secret he does ly,
> Lapped in flowres and pretious spycery,
> By her hid from the world . . .

Spenser thus describes the soul of Sir Philip ("Lay," 77–84):

> Whilest in sweet dreame to him presented bee
> Immortall *beauties*, which no eye may see.
> But he them sees, and takes exceeding pleasure
> Of their divine *aspects*, appearing plaine,
> And kindling love in him above all measure,
> Sweet love, still joyous, never feeling paine,
> For what so *goodly forme* he there doth see,
> He may enjoy from jealous rancor free.

Here obviously the poet merges into one heaven the Platonic world of Ideas and that of souls. But in the Garden he similarly depicts what appears to be the seat of Ideas only, Venus' "heavenly hous" (*F. Q.* 3.6.12):

> The house of *goodly formes* and faire *aspects*,
> Whence all the world derives the glorious
> Features of *beautie*, and all shapes select,
> With which High God his workmanship hath deckt.

From the foregoing comparisons it is clear that Spenser describes Venus' house and the abode of Adonis in the mountain paradise in the same terms previously used to describe the soul of Sidney in heaven. Tentatively, then, the mountain represents a paradise for human souls, which is identical with the house of Venus introduced at the outset of the Garden episode. Further evidence seems to confirm these conclusions. It will be convenient to discuss the second of the foregoing equations before considering the symbolism of the mountain.

III. The Relation of Garden and Mountain

In the first place, the Garden narrative alone strongly supports the identification of Venus' house with the mountain. Stanza 11 recounts Venus' loss of Cupid, who

descends from "her blisfull bowre of joy above" to do mischief in the world. This bower or "hous" is described in the next stanza as the Platonic world of Ideas, which in the fourth hymn (82–84) is separate from the world of souls.[19] Near the conclusion of the Garden episode, it has not been noticed, stazas 49 and 50 resume the Cupid theme, originally suggested from Moschus' *Love the Runaway,* which Spenser had read in Tasso. These stanzas announce that, when Cupid has "with spoiles and cruelty Ransackt the world," he "resortes" to the mountain paradise, and the plain implication is that in this place Venus first missed him. Moreover, the reader is prevented from supposing that both had come from some other heaven by Spenser's announcement that on this mountain live Psyche and Pleasure, to both of whose care Amoret is here committed. Mrs. Bennett among others remembers that traditionally "the marriage of Cupid and Psyche took place after Psyche's reception in heaven, and that their daughter, Pleasure, was born after that reunion."[20] Spenser's poetic geography is not confused. From the initial allusion to Cupid in stanza 11 to the concluding stanzas of the episode he is thinking of Venus' "blisfull bowre of joy" or "hous" as the "stately mount," although that identification does not become necessary for the reader until the setting passes from the lower garden to the mountain paradise.

Moreover, the mount is explicitly *inside* the garden. Accordingly, when in *Colin Clout* Spenser writes of Venus (803–804):

> So pure and spotlesse Cupid forth she brought,
> And in the Gardens of Adonis nurst,

there is no inconsistency, for the mountain garden is within the Garden of Adonis. "According to the *Symposium,*" observes Mrs. Bennett,[21] "Cupid was born in the

[19]The two worlds were often identified by the Platonists; cf. Mrs. Bennett, *op. cit.,* 52–53, who cites Palengenius.

[20]*Ibid.,* 78.

[21]*Ibid.,* 53.

Garden of Jove, a place identified by both Ficino and Pico with the Ideas. Spenser seems to be identifying the garden of Adonis with the garden of Jove, the ideas with the forms." This writer is incorrect, then, only in not recognizing Spenser's mount as the scene of that association with Jove's garden.[22] The significance of this union of garden and mount lies in the harmony of the ideas themselves which these symbols set forth. In his account of Amoret, in stanzas 29 and 51, the poet is perhaps misleading but certainly not contradictory. The first states that Venus brought Amoret,

> to her joyous paradize,
> Wher most she wonnes, when she on earth does dwell.

The Garden Spenser then identifies by associating it with Paphos, Cytheron, and Cnidos. At the end, having completed his description of the mountain inside the Garden, he straightway announces,

> Hether great Venus brought this infant fayre.

In committing Amoret to the care of Psyche and Pleasure,[23] obviously Spenser's consistent purpose was that the mountain paradise be the scene of her education.

Before discussing the poet's purpose in associating thus intimately the mountain with the garden below, it will be profitable to dwell briefly upon this geographical relationship. Is Spenser's method here elsewhere illustrated in the *Faerie Queene?* The Garden of Adonis is first described

---

[22]Cf. also her interpretation of Adonis, *ibid.*, 72: "But Adonis is more than the life-giving sun; he is the symbol of the generative force in creation, represented in the material world by the sun, and *in the ideal world by Jove,* in whose garden the Ideas are planted like trees, according to Pico" (italics mine).

[23]"The daughter born to Cupid and Psyche in heaven is no earthly pleasure . . . but rather that Pleasure which the soul experiences when, led heavenward by Love, it contemplates the eternal Ideas, represented at this stage by their images, the forms. This spiritual pleasure Psyche made the companion of the growing Amoret, who was being 'lessoned in all the lore of love and goodly womanhead" (Bennett, *ibid.*, 78–79).

as a typical paradise in many particulars like the Bower of Bliss (*F. Q.* 2.12). This seems to preclude a second paradise which is geographically within the Garden yet allegorically separate from it. The text is explicit, for, after the account of destructive Time which in the Garden

> Does mow the flowring herbes and goodly things,

the new theme follows in stanza 43:

> Right in the middest of that paradise
> There stood a stately mount, on whose round top
> A gloomy grove of mirtle trees[24] did rise,
> Whose shady boughes sharp steele did never lop . . .

Obviously this is a new setting free from Time's influence. It remains to show wherein such a double setting exemplifies a method not unusual in Spenser's epic.

In connection with Book Two, Professor Greenlaw has called attention to the poet's "double geography."[25] Three times there, it is pointed out, Guyon visits the fairy Otherworld, whereas he has been in Fairyland all the time. Incidentally, two of these fairy places, the Island of Idleness and the Bower of Bliss, are earthly paradises, the latter particularly being in the poet's mind as he began the account of the Garden of Adonis.[26] A more striking analogue with the garden geography is the paradise on

---

[24]For possible sources for the physical features of the mountain see Mrs. Bennett, *ibid.*, 49–50. A myrtle grove appears in *Aeneid* 6.443–444. It has been suggested earlier in the present study (cf. *supra*, n. 4) that Spenser's myrtles may reflect Ovid's Adonis narrative, the transformation of Myrrha.

[25]Edwin Greenlaw, "Spenser's Fairy Mythology," *SP*, XV (1918), 105–122; cf. especially 107–109.

[26]Cf. the description of Genius (2.12.47–48). And in the earlier fairy genealogy (2.10.71) Spenser states that the first man or "Elfe," wandering through the world,

> Did in the gardins of Adonis fynd

a Fay, "th' authour of all woman kynd." Here, as Mrs. Bennett notes (*op. cit.*, 48), Spenser identifies for the moment the Garden of Adonis with Eden; both share the paradise tradition.

Mount Acidale (*F. Q.* 6.10).[27] Here in a place "far from all peoples troad," Sir Calidore, knight of Courtesy, comes upon a fairy scene. To this place Venus often resorts; here her Graces dance to the pipe of Colin; in the center sits Rosalind, a fourth Grace. The whole episode has a special and separate meaning, although harmony is maintained between the two themes and hence between the two settings. Briefly, when occasion arises to emphasize a motif or to make an important distinction, the poet who teaches doctrine by "ensample" creates a concrete symbol to serve the new purpose without regard for logical consistency. In the examples cited from Books Two and Six that purpose is ethical and aesthetic; in Book Three it is speculative.

By way of summary thus far, it has been seen that the mount is separate from the garden; it is a paradise for human souls similar to those described in the *Ruines of Time* and in the "Lay of Clorinda"; it is to be identified with the house of Venus, from which she descends and to which she brings Amoret; and its geographical relation to the lower garden is consistent with Spenser's method elsewhere. In order to perceive the significance of this mountain—at once distinct from the lower garden and intimately linked with it—it is necessary to review Spenser's elaboration of the major naturalistic theme.

IV. The Philosophy of the Garden

The poet's concern in the Garden of Adonis is with the union of form and substance: the instability of the one, the constant immutability of the other. That this theme is a thoroughly naturalistic one in the sense that in the Garden humanity is placed upon a level with all other life on earth, Professor Greenlaw recognized in his study of Spenser and Lucretius. "For the chief point about the entire passage in Spenser is that these souls grow in the

[27] Cf. Lotspeich (*op. cit.*, pp. 3–4) for a discussion of this episode with which he exemplifies Spenser's characteristic use of mythology. The presence of the Graces on this mount harmonizes with the theme of courtesy which the poet then resumes in the lower setting.

Garden of Dame Nature in precisely the same manner as the flowers and trees and all the animals."[28] Without subtleties, Spenser adopts the naturalistic myth of Venus and Adonis and follows it through honestly. Mankind is here subject to no special dispensation, no origin more divine than that of the humblest flower. All things grow in the garden, and, he adds,

> remember well the mighty word
> Which first was spoken by th' Almighty Lord.

As the divine motif, introduced in the mention of the house of Venus, is later to receive special designation in the mountain paradise, this echo from Genesis remains the only positive divine allusion in the lower garden.[29] The roles

---

[28]Edwin Greenlaw, "Spenser and Lucretius," *SP*, XVII (1920), 445. Miss Evelyn Albright, "Spenser's Cosmic Philosophy and His Religion," *PMLA*, XLIV (1929), 715–759, argues for Empedocles and points out certain biblical reminiscences. Mrs. Bennett, *op. cit.*, also rejecting the theory of Lucretian elements, believes the entire episode based upon Platonism and Neo-Platonism. Stirling, *op. cit.*, rejects Lucretius in favor of Golding's Ovid, but he accepts Greenlaw's recognition of the materialistic theme in the Garden. He remarks (503–504) that "in his work as a whole Spenser gave ample significance to the dignity of man. . . . In the Adonis lines Spenser is simply writing of one aspect of creation, that of substance and form. Man must have these two elemental constituents, and in so far as they are concerned, his origin is common to the plants and animals. Within these limitations Spenser is not concerned over naturalism versus special creation, but merely with reproduction and multiplication. . . . Let other passages in Spenser take care of the more dignified aspects of the human genesis." Lotspeich, *op. cit.*, p. 25, has a similar view of the materialistic theme in the Garden. But in the allusion to Venus' "heavenly hous" (which he in no way connects with the later mount) he recognizes the divine motif: "This is important, for it constitutes a mythological way of saying, first, that the Garden of Adonis is not the whole picture of life, but only on its physical, naturalistic side, and, second, that Venus represents more than a physical principle. She has an earthly house and a heavenly house." The present study amplifies that thesis by identifying this residence with the mountain. Thus the Garden *does* present "the whole picture of life."

[29]Agreement is fairly general that by the "thousand, thousand babes" awaiting incarnation in the garden the poet means human

of Adonis as the sun and Venus as the earth are those of the naturalistic myth (*F. Q.* 3.6.8–9) :

> Great father he of generation
> Is rightly cald, th' authour of life and light;
> And his faire sister for creation
> Ministreth matter fit, which, tempered right
> With heate and humour, breedes the living wight.[30]

This passage epitomizes the theme of the lower garden where form (Adonis) meets substance (Venus) in the creative act. Yet the allegory of the later mountain passage is closely related to the poet's use of the word *form* in the lower garden. The question of whether or not Spenser admits pure form or soul in the lower garden can be answered only by observing what distinction, if any, the poet there implies between humanity and other life.

All things growing in the Garden are said to be arranged in rows (stanza 35) :

> Infinite shapes of creatures there are bred,
> And uncouth formes, which none yet ever knew;
> And every sort is in a sondry bed
> Set by it selfe, and ranckt in comely rew;
> Some fitt for reasonable sowles t'indew,
> Some made for beasts, some made for birds to weare . . .

Spenser uses the word *form* in two distinct senses, both of which are, however, expressions of one and the same idea. When writing of souls in paradise, loosely in the Platonic sense he identifies form with soul. This coincides with the

---

souls; cf. Saurat, *op. cit.*, p. 187, Bennett, *op. cit.*, 77, and Stirling, *op. cit.*, 517–518. Mrs. Bennett aptly remarks (77) : "But by describing rather than naming these inhabitants of the garden, Spenser manages to get his allegory well under way without startling or surprising his reader with the daring of his conception." It may be recalled in passing that in the "Lay of Clorinda" Spenser compared the human soul to a babe (69),

> Where like a new-borne babe it soft doth lie.

[30]Mrs. Bennett, *op. cit.*, 72–73, cites also *Colin Clout*, 859 ff., and the second hymn, 106 ff. Stirling, *op. cit.*, 511, finds the source of the present passage in Golding's Ovid (*Met.* 1. 495 ff.).

myth, for Adonis is the "father of all formes." No ultimate contradiction arises as the soul-form is incarnated and thereafter fashions the flesh. In the second hymn this idea is tersely expressed (132–133):

> For of the soule the bodie forme doth take:
> For soule is forme, and doth the bodie make.

Mrs. Bennett suggests that the above lines from the Garden passage might imply "that the poet was thinking of the forms only, of human souls, as growing plants in this garden, while the rational part came from somewhere else."[31] This would hardly be denied by the poet of the second hymn, whose theme, however, in the garden is a different one. Yet without contradiction, *in* the garden the word *form* is actually used, as Stirling notes, "only in the sense of a 'shape,' fleeting and mutable, which arises from substance."[32] Spenser now explains the phenomenon as it applies universally to all life (stanza 38):

> The substance is not chaungd nor altered,
> But th' only forme and outward fashion;
> For every substance is conditioned
> To chaunge her hew, and sondry formes to don,
> Meet for her temper and complexion:
> For formes are variable, and decay
> By course of kind and by occasion;
> And that faire flowre of beautie fades away,
> As doth the lilly fresh before the sunny ray.

Granted that Spenser here uses *form* in the sense of mutable shape, the obscurity of the lines comes from the fact that he is referring to *all* life—plants, animals, and man. Unstable shapes and colors constitute one phase of form-change. Definition being secondary in a stanza predicating change of form as opposed to eternity of substance, the implications here are made clear in two passages elsewhere: the second hymn, 65–70, and the "Mutabilitie Cantos," 7.7.19.

---

[31] *Op. cit.*, 61.

[32] *Op. cit.*, 524.

In the first Spenser denies,

> That Beautie is nought else but mixture made
> Of colours faire, and goodly temp'rament
> Of pure complexions, that shall quickly fade
> And passe away, like to a sommers shade,
> Or that it is but comely composition
> Of parts well measurd, with meet disposition!

Were that true, flowers or pictures, having beauty of color and harmony, "proportion of the outward part," would be as impressive as are these same aspects in human kind. Thus the poet distinguishes human beauty as an expression of soul. The passage from the garden has no such immediate purpose, for it includes all creatures, the external forms of which decay according to species or "kind,"

> By course of kind and by occasion.

The word *occasion,* peculiarly used here, comprises mental changes with the years, fluctuation and caprice of mood within a shorter space of time. This, it would seem, applies chiefly to humanity, as the second passage now makes clear.

Spenser's Mutability has described restless change and final decay of all things. In stanza 19 Spenser turns from an Ovidian reminiscence to describe aspects of human change:

> And men themselves doe change continually,
> From youth to eld, from wealth to poverty,
> From good to bad, from bad to worst of all:
> Ne doe their bodies only flit and fly;
> But eeke their minds (which they immortall call)
> Still change and vary thoughts, as new occasions fall.

There is no question here of the immortality of the soul, nor any statement of its relation to mind, as it has been remarked.[33] The parentheses modifying "minds" would

[33]Following Greenlaw, Saurat, *op. cit.*, p. 210, mistakenly supposes that "Mutability's argument is broken off: the conclusion *then man wholly dies* is not given." He thus finds the passage "pure raillery." The correct reading is noted by W. P. Cumming, "The Influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* on Spenser's 'Mutabilitie Cantos,'" *SP,*

seem to mean, Which men are accustomed to consider immortal. But Spenser's theme is the mortality of thought. He doubtless recalls the argument of Lucretius that as the mind decays before the body, the mind cannot be immortal.[34] The awkwardness of the passage denotes his narrow avoidance of this equation of soul and mind; the mind, as he states here and in the Garden passage, is subject to constant change and final dissolution. Both passages frankly present the phenomenon, and the direction of Spenser's inquiry, so abundantly reflected elsewhere in his poetry, is not unlike that of his friend Sidney, who touched upon the same mystery:[35]

> Thus, thus, the mindes which over all doe climb,
> When they by yeares experience get best graces,
> Must finish then by death's detested crime.

XXVIII (1931), 250–251, and by Mrs. Bennett, "Spenser's Venus and the Goddess Nature," *SP*, XXX (1933), 183. The predication in the final line, it now appears, bears a significant relation to the poet's thought in the Garden passage.

[34]Shelley, who knew Lucretius, may well have remembered also Spenser's lines in *Adonais*, 177–180:

> Nought we know, dies. Shall that alone which knows
> Be as a sword consumed before the sheath
> By sightless lightning?

Cf. further Lane Cooper, "Notes on Byron and Shelley," *MLN*, XXIII (1908), 118–119.

[35]*Arcadia*, ed. A. Feuillerat, I, 501. In "November" of the *Calender* Spenser repeats an age-old contrast to which he imparts a new emphasis in the loss in death of human personality, character, virtue (83 ff.):

> Whence is it that the flowret of the field doth fade
> And lyeth buryed long in winters bale:
> Yet soone as spring his mantle doth displaye,
> It floureth fresh as it should never fayle?
> But thing on earth that is of most availe,
> As vertues braunch and beauties budde,
> Reliven not for any good. . . .
> The braunch once dead, the budde eke needes must quaile.

In "The Feeling for Nature in Spenser" Saurat, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 ff., broaches a subject which invites comprehensive study to supplement the surveys of F. W. Moorman, *The Interpretation of Nature in English Poetry* (Strassburg, 1905) ch. 12, "Spenser," R. Schram, *Spensers Naturschilderungen* (Leipzig, 1908), and others.

The foregoing discussion emphasizes the fact of Spenser's preoccupation in the Garden with the union of form and substance. His exclusion of pure form or soul from a consideration of mutable forms denotes possibly an unwillingness to permit the supernatural to share the natural. This suggestion seems to be borne out by an examination of the function of Time, which separates the two realms of the Garden, the mountain from the lower setting.

Stanza 38, which explains the mutability of forms, is closely followed by an explanation of Time's ravages in the garden, and the presence of this apparently discordant element has not been satisfactorily explained.[36] Of the two points which are of immediate relevance, the first pertains to the connection of Time with the preceding stanza 38. Here Spenser has stated that colors fade, that "harmony of the outward part" vanishes, and that the mind itself dies: all are "conditioned," that is, bound as by a contract,[37] to change. Accordingly, without regard for consistency with what has gone before, the three Time stanzas (39–41) elaborate this idea by "ensample." In the second place, these stanzas serve an important transitional function as Spenser now passes to the divine theme symbolized by the mountain paradise. Thus in so far as the mount is free from Time the lower garden, subject to Time, becomes momentarily the phenomenal world in which occur the changes explained in stanza 38. With the introduction of Time, then, "the garden passes into the phenomenal world where death prevails"[38] only as a prelude to the divine motif. Recognition of this double function of the Time stanzas enhances the impression of deliberate plan and

---

[36]For a review of various opinions cf. Stirling, *op. cit.*, 525–528. Concluding that Time does not lay waste the garden itself, this writer states (533): "The only reading possible is that shapes growing there live and flourish, but are in the end mortal." This opinion is ultimately the same as that now to be stated.

[37]This definition is quoted from R. E. N. Dodge, Student's Cambridge *Spenser*, p. 797.

[38]Saurat, *op. cit.*, p. 192, who admitting the lyrical beauty of the Garden recognizes only philosophical "nonsense."

continuity throughout the entire episode. Having effected transition from the garden theme by means of an element which distinguishes that theme, the poet further adds the geographical distinction as he passes to the complementary mountain paradise.

V. The Philosophy of the Mountain

The manner in which Spenser has converted the motives of metamorphoses and paradise into palpable suggestions of divinity on this "stately mount" has been set forth in earlier portions of this study. So it is important to note here, first, the deliberate fusion of the allegory of the mountain with that of the lower naturalistic garden; having achieved an important distinction, he now intimately relates mount with lower garden. In the first place, the poet introduces two details previously omitted. The prerogative of Persephone is forever denied *because* this mount is a heavenly paradise: there for her pleasure Venus claims eternal possession of Adonis, who is (stanza 46),

> By her hid from the world, and from the skill
> Of Stygian gods, which doe her love envy.

The boar, original cause of the separation of Adonis from Venus, stands for winter, also denied in this paradise (stanza 48):

> For that wilde bore, the which him once annoyd,
> She firmly hath emprisoned for ay . . .

This interpretation of the boar, accepted by Lotspeich,[39] is inevitable. It cannot be identified with Chaos, as Greenlaw believed,[40] for with different context Chaos is included in an earlier passage in which Spenser dwells upon the immortality of Adonis (stanza 47):

---

[39] *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

[40] "Spenser and Lucretius," *SP*, XVII (1920), 454.

> for he may not
> For ever dye, and ever buried bee
> In balefull night, where all thinges are forgot;
> All be he subject to mortalitie,
> Yet is eterne in mutabilitie,
> And by succession made perpetuall,
> Transformed oft, and chaunged diverslie:
> For him the father of all formes they call;
> Therefore needs mote he live, that living gives to all.

The principle of succession announced here repeats the philosophy of the lower garden (stanza 33) : mutable form becomes immutably fixed in natural law. The eternal succession of incarnation and return later to the garden to await reincarnation had been likened to a wheel,

> So like a wheele around they ronne from old to new.

Now stated explicitly, this law is represented as that which gives stability to the world and prevents the return of Chaos, or "balefull night."[41]

So much, then, by way of repetition of the naturalistic doctrine set forth by example in the lower Garden. Thus Spenser has implied an absence of contradiction between this natural doctrine and that symbolized in this eternal mountain. For here Adonis, who is "father of all formes," is also pure form, soul. In this duplication Spenser's method is characteristic. When he writes of Venus Pandemos, for example, the poet does not forget her intimate relation with Venus Urania; so here when he passes from Adonis as the "great father of generation" of infinite forms to tell of his eternal union with his mistress,

---

[41]Cf. *F.Q.* 7.6.14, where Chaos is associated with "eternall night," and *Ruines of Rome*, 22, "great Chaos wombe." In both passages the return of Chaos is linked with the end of the world. But as Chaos supplies the substances necessary for creation (cf. *F.Q.* 3.6.36), naturally Venus presides over it. The Garden of Adonis thus includes both associations with Chaos. Cf. Stirling, *op. cit.*, 536–537, who cites *F.Q.* 4.10.47, and the first hymn, 57–70, on the subject of Venus' relation with Chaos. Earlier (532) he distinguishes Chaos, source of substance, from the garden, where it joins with form.

he forgets neither theme as Adonis now joins that company of youths of which Sidney is a member.[42] The oneness of Adonis as of Venus in these two roles serves to recognize the spiritual dignity of humanity and its common origin in the garden with plants and animals. Pure form, absent from the garden below, resides in this world of forms, Spenser identifying for the moment the Platonic realms of Ideas and of souls. The poet has closely linked garden with mount; he distinguishes them in a manner consistent with the Platonic hierarchy in terms of which the whole episode is fashioned. Considered thus, the Garden of Adonis, an earthly paradise suggesting Cytheron, Paphos, and Cnidos, yet presents structurally a replica of visible and invisible worlds: lower garden and mount. Venus operates in both, and with both Adonis is closely knit.

The major purpose in this study of explaining Spenser's mount as a symbol of divinity and of suggesting its relation to the lower garden has not involved a minute review of the entire Garden of Adonis—an undertaking which has been made unnecessary by previous studies. It is hoped that, in so far as the present inquiry modifies the results of others, it thereby affords a more complete picture of the harmony which Spenser achieved. This harmony, it is obvious, extends beyond the Garden of Adonis to include the poet's other great speculative poem, the "Mutabilitie Cantos." Upon this subject a few comments here may not be out of place.

Essentially, the realm of Mutability corresponds to the garden exclusive of the mount. For although her invasion of the heavens occasioned the court assembly and trial,

---

[42]In part only, then, may the mount be regarded as "a charming allegorized repetition of the same theme" (Stirling, *ibid.*, 537). Though she nowhere admits the mount as a separate entity, Mrs. Bennett sees a two-fold purpose in Spenser's garden (74): "It is at once an earthly paradise and a pattern of life, a meeting place of temporal ephemera and eternal reality."

the burden of her argument has to do with the sub-lunar realm long held under her sway. In the Garden an immutable law governs this law of change: all things attain perfection by incarnation and by return later to the garden to await another cycle. Adonis is thus "eterne in mutabilitie, And by succession made perpetuall." So in the trial a similar judgment is pronounced against Mutability by Nature (*F. Q.* 7.7.58):

> They are not changed from their first estate;
> But by their change their being doe dilate:
> And turning to themselves at length againe,
> Doe worke their owne perfection so by fate.

In both passages the statement of this law is universal in that it includes mankind.[43] Moreover, as in the Garden this law prevents the return to Chaos, to "balefull night, where all things are forgot," so the judgment against Mutability implies the same argument against Chaos, a return of which was threatened by her ambition (*F. Q.* 7.6.14).[44]

---

[43]See previous discussion of stanza 19 from the Garden. Mrs. Bennett, "Spenser's Venus and the Goddess Nature," *SP*, XXX (1933), 176, note 38, corrects the error of supposing man absent from the trial of Mutability.

[44]To Mutability's claims Saurat (cf. note 1 above), pp. 216–217, adds the Proem to Book Five; the two passages, he holds, indicate Spenser's belief in the return of Chaos. To Spenser, "Things are not moving towards perfection but towards destruction. . . . A supreme effort of thought makes him put forward the extreme hypothesis that instead of returning to chaos they will return to perfection." On the contrary, both in the Garden of Adonis and in Nature's answer Spenser affirms that the law of succession achieves *immediate* perfection, that this law imparts a universal stability which prevents a return to Chaos. Furthermore, it should be realized that the Proem to Book Five is distinctly answered by Artegal, whose reply to the Giant (5.2.34–43) affirms divine justice:

> Of things unseene how canst thou deeme aright, . . .
> Sith thou misdeem'st so much of things in sight?

The reality of the unseen is the burden of Artegal's answer. Moreover, three further passages voice this important theme: the mountain paradise of the Garden of Adonis, Spenser's final comment upon

In the Garden of Adonis, it should be remarked, this law of succession is stated simultaneously with the affirmation of divine law; of both Adonis is the symbol. Whereas neither the declarations of Mutability nor the judgment of Nature include divinity, Spenser now adds this motive in the brief passage when he speaks in his own person. He confesses an unwillingness to rest content with Nature's rebuke, confined as it is to an expression of a temporal law—the succession of forms (*F. Q.* 7.8.1–3):

> When I bethinke me on that speech whyleare
> Of Mutabilitie, and well it way,
> Me seemes, that though she all unworthy were
> Of the heav'ns rule, yet, very sooth to say,
> In all things else she beares the greatest sway.

Recalling Nature's prediction of the end of Mutability's rule,

> Of that same time when no more change shall be,
> But stedfast rest of all things, firmly stayd
> Upon the pillours of eternity,
> That is contrayr to Mutabilitie.

he expresses a longing for that time, when

> all shall rest eternally
> With Him that is the God of Sabbaoth hight.

To reconcile the apparent contradiction here with the preceding judgment of Nature, various proposals have been made.[45]

Mutability, and, as Mrs. Bennett notes ("Spenser's Venus and the Goddess Nature," *SP*, XXX, 191) the concluding stanzas of the fourth hymn.

[45]Mrs. Bennett, *ibid.*, 190, thus concludes: "The world is not simply degenerating towards chaos, but creation is a circle of being and perfecting, which returns upon life, and has its rest in eternity when 'all shall changed bee, and from thenceforth none no more change shall see.'" This writer recognizes "a consistent and unified discussion of a serious Platonic problem." Stirling, "The Concluding Stanzas of *Mutabilitie*," *SP*, XXX (1933), 201, finds that Spenser follows Boethius, where a resolution of the same difficulty appears. Both, he believes, "have fused the two notions of defeating change,

It should be recognized that Spenser does not reject Nature's verdict: accepting it, he affirms the existence of divinity, a law superior to that based upon reason. Without contradiction he seems now to declare that divinity, faith, claims also a share of the judgment. The final stanzas of the fragmentary canto thus coincide in the argument with the symbolism of the mountain paradise of the Garden. To say that they represent a will to believe is less correct perhaps than to see in them a positive assurance of an unseen realm. Thus, ultimately, this declaration arises from the same impulse which in the Garden of Adonis is voiced in the symbolic mountain paradise.

Thus Spenser betrays an affinity with John Donne in that both arrive at the conviction that truth is two-fold.[46] Aquinas had separated the claims of reason from those of faith, harmonizing them in the belief that they taught the same truths. This is the doctrine of Spenser's Garden of Adonis. Duns Scotus once more separated the two spheres of thought, the truths of faith higher and beyond the reach of reason. Both operate, however, without contradiction. This suggests the relationship set forth in the "Mutabilitie Cantos." It was Milton who believed Spenser "a better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas." In a new sense, then, perhaps the opinion of Milton may be construed.

---

the first concerning the mutable or fated cycle itself, and the second an approach of things changeable to the stable simplicity, 'that is to seyn,' according to Chaucer's gloss, the 'unmoveabletee' of God."

[46]Cf. the able study of Charles M. Coffin, *John Donne and the New Philosophy* (Columbia University Press, 1937) Chapter XV, "The Two Lights," pp. 280–294.

THE NORTHUMBERLAND OF SHAKESPEARE AND HOLINSHED

By Sarah Dodson

In *Richard II,* Northumberland's actuating motive is, primarily, concern for his own security—security of life, possessions, and position—and it expresses itself in bold and aggressive action. In *Henry IV,* Parts I and II, this motive is still dominant, but it is tempered by caution. Shakespeare finds in Holinshed, I believe, a basis for the fundamental character of his Northumberland, but by omitting, inserting, and changing incidents, he tones down certain traits and gives deeper color to others.

In Holinshed's history,[1] Henry Percy the Elder was one of the prominent figures in public life throughout the reign of Richard II, and before his revolt he made some contribution to the welfare of the state. His title, the Earl of Northumberland, was bestowed on him at the coronation of Richard in 1377; later, he was frequently called into service as a leader against the Scots. At one time a quarrel broke out between him and the Duke of Lancaster (John of Gaunt), which threatened to reach alarming proportions (pp. 439 and 446), but the King managed the situation in such a way that no blood was shed between them. On the other hand, at a critical time in the affairs of state, Northumberland attempted, with a measure of courage, to bring Richard to a realization of his responsibilities as king (p. 459). Shakespeare makes no mention, on the one hand, of animosity between Northumberland and John of Gaunt; but on the other, in no way—not even in a reference to antecedent events in Richard's reign—

---

[1]Raphael Holinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles,* 1586. I am referring throughout this paper to the 1586 edition of Holinshed, but I have also read the parallel account in the 1577 edition, and in all of the incidents in which Northumberland is involved, the two editions agree essentially.

does he credit the Earl with any kind of statesmanlike action.

In *Richard II*,[2] Northumberland appears first in II, i, when he brings in to the King the information that old Gaunt is dead. He then hears Richard's announcement that Gaunt's possessions are to be confiscated, and he is a witness to York's indignant protest against this decision. Immediately afterwards Northumberland sounds out the Lords Ross and Willoughby and persuades them to unite with him in supporting Henry Bolingbroke, who would now fall heir to Gaunt's title, Duke of Lancaster, and to his possessions. Northumberland discloses the fact that he is furnished with definite information about Bolingbroke's plans (lines 277–290); it is evident thus that the events in this scene merely precipitate his action in joining the uprising. In his conversation with Ross and Willoughby, Northumberland represents himself as being concerned for the honor of his country and as being incensed by the King's injustice toward Bolingbroke; his subsequent actions, however, prove the insincerity of these professions and bring out the true reason why he is leaving Richard—fear for himself in the uncertainty of events. Twice in the scene he expresses this fear (lines 241–245 and 263–266):

> The King is not himself, but basely led
> By flatterers; and what they will inform,
> Merely in hate, 'gainst any of us all,
> That will the King severely prosecute
> 'Gainst us, our lives, our children, and our heirs.

> But, lords, we hear this fearful tempest sing,
> Yet seek no shelter to avoid the storm.
> We see the wind sit sore upon our sails,
> And yet we strike not, but securely perish.

That he understands what Henry is after—not justice but the crown itself—is apparent from the following lines in his last speech to these men (lines 291–295):

---

[2]*The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, edited by George Lyman Kittredge, 1936, is the text used in this paper for the three Shakespeare plays.

> If then we shall shake off our slavish yoke,
> Imp out our drooping country's broken wing,
> Redeem from broking pawn the blemish'd crown,
> Wipe off the dust that hides our sceptre's gilt,
> And make high majesty look like itself . . . .

No credence, therefore, can be given to later speeches in which he asserts his faith in Bolingbroke's promise to demand only "his own."

Although this conversation that Northumberland enters into with Ross and Willoughby has no counterpart in the history, yet Holinshed shows that the Earl joins Bolingbroke early in the revolt (p. 498) and soon becomes the pilot of the campaign. He carries on negotiations between Henry and Richard; he is the "master of the campe" when the army is put on display before Richard at Flint; and he makes the final arrangements for a meeting between Richard and Henry (p. 501). Moreover, even though he is responsible to Bolingbroke for his movements, at times he seems to act on his own initiative in carrying out the purpose of his chief. He captures Richard, for example, by a special trick. He is sent ahead of Henry to negotiate with Richard at Conway, and the King finally agrees to set out with him for a conference with Henry at Flint, having been given the assurance that the latter is still a subject who is merely asking for redress of grievances. But the wily Earl has taken the precaution to arrange his men in two ambushes on the way, "behind a craggie mounteine," and through his treachery Richard is easily trapped, "being inclosed with the sea on the one side, and the rocks on the other" (p. 500).

Of the large number of the details in Holinshed from the outbreak of the revolt to the final surrender of Richard, Shakespeare uses only a few. Throughout these events Northumberland is among the figures in the foreground and he comes forward in III, iii, as the spokesman for Bolingbroke; but in Shakespeare his conduct is definitely less dignified than it is in Holinshed. One of Shakespeare's omissions is significant: he leaves out entirely the act of

treachery which leads to the capture of Richard—a deed which, though ignoble, requires a measure of daring. Moreover, he supplies details which make the Earl detestable in petty ways. For example, as Northumberland travels towards Berkeley with Bolingbroke, he turns a conversation on the landscape into a flattering speech, which begins thus (II, iii, 2–7):

> Believe me, noble lord,
> I am a stranger here in Gloucestershire.
> These high wild hills and rough uneven ways
> Draws out our miles, and makes them wearisome;
> And yet your fair discourse hath been as sugar,
> Making the hard way sweet and delectable.

And the compliment to Bolingbroke is stretched out through twelve additional lines. Again, Northumberland's readiness to serve his new master is evident in III, i, 35, when he accepts the commission to execute Bushy and Green. A little later, in a colloquoy among the insurgents before Flint Castle, he angers York by speaking of the absent King as "Richard" rather than "King Richard" (III, iii, 6); and disrespect mounts to impudence farther on in this scene when, as the emissary of Bolingbroke, he comes into the presence of Richard. The Earl's officious rudeness is emphasized when the King breaks out with this reproof (72–75):

> We are amaz'd; and thus long have we stood
> To watch the fearful bending of thy knee,
> Because we thought ourself thy lawful king.
> And if we be, how dare thy joints forget
> To pay their awful duty to our presence?

Richard continues in an impassioned vein, condemning Northumberland for his part in the rebellion and making the accusation that Henry has brought civil war on England. In Northumberland's reply Shakespeare uses a speech from Holinshed, but he heightens the tone: Holinshed's Northumberland seems to be merely the mouthpiece of Bolingbroke as he assures Richard upon oath that Henry, when he has been given justice, will "be readie to come

to him on his knees, to crave of him forgiveness, and as an humble subject," thenceforth to be obedient to the King (p. 500); but Shakespeare's Northumberland piles up oath upon oath for Bolingbroke in declaring that the latter has come only (114, 115)

> for his lineal royalties, and to beg
> Enfranchisement immediate on his knees,

remarking further that Bolingbroke will lay down arms when these purposes have been accomplished. The Earl's extreme zeal in asserting and reiterating the good intentions of Bolingbroke gives to his speech a hollow sound. Thus, by means of these little changes, through a subtle, almost imperceptible process, Shakespeare has transformed the Earl into a less heroic villain than he is in the history.

In Holinshed, the Earl continues to play a major rôle until after Henry's accession. Richard does not come out before Parliament in person to abdicate the throne, but a number of "right honorable and discreet persons" (p. 503), with Northumberland as spokesman, are sent to him in prison to persuade him to renounce his rights as a monarch.[3] He promises to do so, but asks to speak with Bolingbroke and the Archbishop of Canterbury. His request is granted, and at a second conference in the Tower, the royal prisoner, "with a glad countenance" (p. 504), talks at length with Henry and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Then, in the presence of all these nobles, Richard agrees to resign the crown, and, further, insists on reading aloud to the assembled group the text of the resignation which has been prepared, though, as Holinshed observes, "an other meane person" (p. 504) might have read it for him. Richard readily signs the document, and taking a signet ring from his finger, he puts it on the finger

[3]The historian declares that some of Richard's own followers, through motives more or less questionable, have already persuaded him that he can save his life only by giving up the crown. Also, in this scene Northumberland pretends that Richard had already promised to abdicate, in the negotiations previous to his capture (p. 503).

of Henry Bolingbroke. A report is carried back to Parliament, the abdication is accepted, and Henry's claim to the throne is approved. Parliament prepares a list of "the manifold crimes and defaults before doone by king Richard" (p. 505), but because of the press of other matters, the reading of the writ is deferred. After the coronation, when Parliament has re-assembled, the commons ask that, in order to satisfy the people, the causes of the deposing be published; and the lords comply with this request.

In the deposition scene in *Richard II* (IV, i, 162 ff.), the part that Northumberland plays as catspaw to Henry manifests itself in an open and insolent attempt to wrest from the prisoner his last vestige of self-respect. Before Richard is brought into the assembly, Northumberland boldly arrests Carlisle, who has dared to speak out in defence of Richard.[4] Then, after the King has reluctantly handed over the crown to Bolingbroke, Northumberland demands that Richard read in the public hearing the list of accusations against himself. Though the Earl doubtless enjoys persecuting the prisoner, his prime purpose is to fortify Henry's claim to the throne by stripping Richard of even the semblance of kingliness. His own security and exaltation are bound up with Bolingbroke's, and the people must be convinced that Richard has committed unpardonable crimes against them. It is to be noted, however, that in spite of Northumberland's importunity, his victory is not complete: his relentless insistence is checked by Bolingbroke, who is the shrewder of the two. In this scene there is a direct contrast between Holinshed and Shakespeare in several important points that have a bearing on Northumberland's character. (1) In Holinshed, the nobles, with Northumberland at their head, and finally Bolingbroke and the Archbishop of Canterbury, visit Richard in the Tower; in Shakespeare, Richard, by command, comes out into the presence of Parliament. (2) In Holinshed, Richard

[4]In Holinshed, the arrest occurs much in the same manner, but at a later time, after Henry's authority has been established.

readily agrees to resign the throne, voluntarily placing on Henry's finger a ring, the symbol of authority; in Shakespeare, an unwilling assent is extracted from Richard as he hands over the crown to Henry. (3) In Holinshed, Richard, as a prisoner in the Tower, voluntarily reads aloud the document of resignation, and, further, Northumberland takes no active part in seeing that an account of Richard's crimes is published; in Shakespeare, Richard holds out against the Earl's repeated demand that he read aloud the writ which recounts his own misdoings. And, to make a generalization, (4) in Shakespeare, Richard is definitely less humble that he is in Holinshed and Northumberland more arrogant and less politic. Holinshed's Northumberland, unswerving though he is in his purpose, displays a suave dignity in his bearing which is very different from the insulting behavior of the same character in Shakespeare.

Only twice again does Northumberland appear in *Richard II*, and on neither occasion does he show any softness towards his victims. In V, i, in his capacity as an official of the new government, he hurries the captive King away to Pomfret, ruthlessly breaking up the Queen's last conversation with her husband. Holinshed merely records the fact that Richard was sent first to Leeds and then to Pomfret; he makes no mention of the Earl of Northumberland (p. 507). Then, in the last scene of the play, the Earl enters to report to King Henry that he has sent the heads of several revolted lords to London (V, vi, 7–10). In Holinshed, there is murmuring against King Henry, the Earl of Northumberland, and other lords who are a part of Henry's inner circle, because they have saved the lives of certain leaders who have been enemies to the new cause (p. 513); but nowhere in *Richard II* does Northumberland express generosity towards any of Richard's allies. It seems clear that Shakespeare deliberately excludes Northumberland from any appearance of leniency, thus giving emphasis to the heartless nature of the Earl's ambition.

The new king shows in this last scene that he is aware of a debt to the Earl (V, vi, 10, 11):

> We thank thee, gentle Percy, for thy pains
> And to thy worth will add right worthy gains.

But it is unlikely that at this stage he foresees the full measure of the payment that is to be exacted from him. In an earlier scene Richard has called Northumberland "the ladder" on which "the mounting Bolingbroke" was enabled to ascend the throne, and has predicted that the Earl will not be satisfied with his rewards and that his love for Henry will soon turn to hate (V, 1, 55–68). This prophetic speech points definitely to events that come to pass near the beginning of the action in *Henry IV*, Part I.

As Holinshed's narrative progresses, it is evident that Northumberland's power reaches its zenith with the accession of Henry, and soon thereafter begins to decline. The two elder Percys see in the new king's "wealth and felicitie" a cause for envy (p. 521). The first real outbreak comes when Henry demands that they surrender the Scottish prisoners that they have taken at Holmedon. In the revolt that follows, Worcester and young Henry Percy are the moving spirits, and on the eve of battle the Earl fails to appear. Holinshed records the circumstances thus: "The earle of Northumberland himselfe was not with them, but, being sicke, had promised upon his amendement to repaire unto them (as some write) with all convenient speed" (p. 522). Though Northumberland is in the field soon after the battle of Shrewsbury, he makes his own peace with the King, in spite of the fact that his son and his brother have both lost their lives in the rebellion. Moreover, he receives back all his possessions except the Isle of Man. At a later time, in order to clear himself of complicity in another conspiracy, he brings to King Henry, by command, his nephews and his nephews' sons (p. 525). But he is now a rebel at heart. In a short time he becomes the leader in a plot against the King, and when he hears that his chief confederate, the Archbishop of York, has surrendered to the enemy, he flees first to Berwick and then to Scotland (p. 530). After much political maneuvering outside of

England, he finally comes back with a large force, accompanied by Lord Bardolph, and meets a division of the King's army under the Sheriff of Yorkshire. Holinshed's account of this last conflict is as follows: "The shiriffe was as readie to give battell as the earle to receive it, and so with a standard of S. George spred, set fiercelie upon the earle, who, under a standard of his owne armes, incountred his adversaries with great manhood. There was a sore incounter and cruell conflict betwixt the parties, but in the end the victorie fell to the shiriffe. The lord Bardolfe was taken, but sore wounded, so that he shortlie after died of the hurts. As for the earle of Northumberland, he was slaine outright" (p. 534). Thus the Earl dies in rebellion, but not altogether ignobly.

Shakespeare sees, I think, the fundamental baseness in Holinshed's Northumberland, and he allows no trace of the heroic to appear in the corresponding character in the two Henry plays. The Earl is feared as a public enemy, but largely because of his reputation and his influence, not because of what he actually accomplishes at this period in his life. All that is narrowly selfish in his nature is pushed to the front and becomes the ruling force in his behavior. After Henry's interests and his own begin to diverge, no straightforward route is open to him, and his actions are vacillating and unpredictable. Finally, neither his family nor his allies can depend on him for loyalty.

In *Henry IV*, Part I, Shakespeare makes use of a skeleton of the historical narrative, but he makes changes and omissions in a very significant fashion. Here, it seems to me, Northumberland's part in the action is even less prominent than it is in the history. In the scene where the quarrel breaks out between the Percys and the King, the Earl makes a brief speech of protest against the King's charges (I, iii, 22–28); but in the conversation that ensues after the King has withdrawn, he calls Hotspur a "wasp-stung and impatient fool" for allowing his anger to run away with him (iii, 236); and although he agrees with Worcester and Hotspur in their resentment against Henry,

he is not as enthusiastic about the projected rebellion as the other two are. Crafty prudence now circumscribes his actions. What he sees in the temper of Hotspur as the sort of rashness which may lead them all into disaster, King Henry interprets later as daring courage—a quality which is truly noble. In dealing with the report of the Earl's illness and his failure to join Worcester and Hotspur on the battlefield, Shakespeare makes enlarged use of the doubt that Holinshed throws on the genuineness of Northumberland's sickness by the phrase "as some write" (see quotation from Holinshed above).[5] In the scene where the Messenger comes in with the announcement that the Earl is ill, Hotspur's impatient exclamation (IV, i, 16, 17)—

> Zounds! how has he leisure to be sick
> In such a justling time?

and Worcester's frosty comment (25–27)—

> I would the state of time had first been whole
> Ere he by sickness had been visited.
> His health was never better worth than now—

both suggest that the Earl may be feigning illness. Furthermore, in the same conversation Worcester expresses apprehension that the public will mistrust Northumberland's motives (62–65):

> It will be thought
> By some that know not why he is away
> That wisdom, loyalty, and mere dislike
> Of our proceedings kept the Earl from hence.

In Henry IV, Part II, the suspicion that the Earl is now looking out for himself, with little regard for others, is confirmed. In the "Prologue," at the beginning of the play, Rumor accuses the Earl of having been "crafty sick" (1. 37); and in the first scene, although Northumberland

---

[5]Whether the phrase is attached grammatically to "being sicke" or to some other expression in the sentence, the effect is to throw doubt on the Earl's integrity.

speaks as if he were recovering from an illness and pretends that grief and rage at his son's death are now arousing him to action, nevertheless in his last speech in the conversation he significantly links together "safety" and "revenge" (I, i, 212, 213):

> Go in with me; and counsel every man
> The aptest way for safety and revenge.

Further proof that his spirit is now craven comes out in II, iii, where he is discussing with his wife and the widowed Lady Percy the question of whether he shall keep his promise and join the insurgents against Henry, or go to Scotland. Lady Percy gives vent to a bitter reproach for his failure to come to the aid of his son in that last crisis (10, 12–15):

> The time was, father, that you broke your word . . .
> When your own Percy, when my heart's dear Harry
> Threw many a northward glance to see his father
> Bring up his powers; but he did long in vain.
> Who then persuaded you to stay at home?

In spite of her taunt, however, he decides to flee to Scotland, and thus puts his own immediate safety above his honor (65–68):

> Fain would I go to meet the Archbishop,
> But many thousand reasons hold me back.
> I will resolve for Scotland. There am I,
> Till time and vantage crave my company.

Here Shakespeare makes an important change: he reverses the order of events in one particular and thus throws on Northumberland the chief responsibility for the failure of the uprising. That is, in Holinshed Northumberland flees to Scotland *after* the Archbishop and his allies have surrendered (p. 530), but in this play he leaves *before* the leaders in the revolt have made terms with the enemy. The Archbishop reports the news of his flight thus (IV, i, 7–16):

> I must acquaint you that I have receiv'd
> New-dated letters from Northumberland,
> Their cold intent, tenure, and substance thus:
> Here doth he wish his person, with such powers
> As might hold sortance with his quality,
> The which he could not levy; whereupon
> He is retir'd, to ripe his growing fortunes,
> To Scotland; and concludes in hearty prayers
> That your attempts may overlive the hazard
> And fearful meeting of their opposite.

Mowbray's comment, in answer, is brief (17, 18):

> Thus do the hopes we have in him touch ground
> And dash themselves to pieces.

One other departure from Holinshed's narrative deserves notice. Shakespeare ignores entirely the statement in Holinshed that the Earl "incountered his adversaries with great manhood" (see above) in the last contest with the King's forces; for, in *Henry IV*, Part II, Northumberland fades out of the picture when the news is brought to the King that he has been overthrown.

The essential differences between Shakespeare's Northumberland and Holinshed's can be summarized briefly. Holinshed's character shows, in the earlier years, a degree of political skill which, on the whole, Shakespeare denies to his Earl. Moreover, in the historical Northumberland, traces of a heroic spirit flare up, though spasmodically, even until his death; but in Shakespeare the Earl finally loses every remnant of true courage. Ambition is dominant in both characters, but in Shakespeare, from the beginning, it is a smaller, more contemptible quality than it is in the history. Shakespeare has formed his Northumberland in a narrow mold, chiefly, it seems, by sharpening and intensifying the selfish traits that he finds in Holinshed's character.

PURITANISM IN THE PLAYS AND PAMPHLETS OF THOMAS DEKKER

BY MARY GRACE MUSE ADKINS

Though Thomas Dekker cannot take rank with Ben Jonson in abundance or virulence of satire against the Puritans, he was by no means insensible to the opportunities they afforded a dramatist familiar with London life and eager to exploit its possibilities. The whole body of his writings contains sufficient material to warrant analysis and evaluation. Because of the satiric method employed by Dekker himself, analysis can best be made by a separate consideration of Puritan characters in the plays and of incidental allusions to Puritanism in both plays and pamphlets. From the material presented, I shall attempt an evaluation of Dekker's attitude towards Puritanism—a procedure suggested by Dekker's own inconsistencies and by previous critical judgments on the subject that seem to me inconclusive.

I

Unlike those of Jonson, who directed his chief satire through full-length portraits, Dekker's plays[1] contain few out-and-out Puritan characters. Only one, the Puritan in *If this be not a good Play, the Diuell is in it,* is specifically

[1]The *Mermaid Edition* (*Thomas Dekker,* ed. by Ernest Rhys, New York) has been used for all plays included in that series—namely, *The Shoemakers' Holiday, The Honest Whore, Parts I* and *II, Old Fortunatus, The Witch of Edmonton.* References to these plays will be indicated by M. and page number. References to all other plays are to Shepherd's four-volume edition of *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* (published by Pearson, London, 1873) and will be indicated by P., with volume and page number. The text used for a study of Dekker's pamphlets has been *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker,* ed. by Alexander B. Grosart (five volumes, London, 1884–6). References to the pamphlets will be indicated by G., with volume and page number.

designated and characterized as a Puritan. Four others—Ampedo in *Old Fortunatus,* Parenthesis in *West-ward Hoe,* Margery in *The Shoemakers' Holiday,* and Roger in *The Honest Whore, Part I*—Dekker intends to present as Puritans, though their Puritan traits are but incidental to a larger portraiture.

The Puritan in *If this be not a good Play, the Diuell is in it* appears only at the end of the play, in a disjointed scene where certain souls arrive in hell for their ultimate disposition. After a colloquy with the judges each spirit is given over to the prescribed tortures. The last to enter, heralded by "a confused noyse to come pressing in," is "a Ghoast, cole-blacke," a Puritan.[2]

It is significant that, with the exception of one trait, this Puritan is described in terms that pretty clearly designate him as an Anabaptist, certainly as one of the exiled Englishmen of the Separatist group. When one of the characters remarks upon his very obvious physical deformity, he exclaims in reply:

> How can I choose but halt, goe lame, and crooked?
> When I pulld a whole church downe vpon my backe?[3]

The factiousness supposed to characterize Puritans of his type is suggested by the judge's answering comment:

> Hence with him, he will pull all hell downe too,[4]

and by a later remark of Pluto:

> Theile confound our kingdome,
> If here they get but footing.[5]

Two characteristics, though not so specifically indicated by Dekker, mark him with equal clearness as an Anabaptist or a Brownist: his reliance on the Spirit and his zeal. When Minos asks him:

---

[2]P., III, 358.
[3]P., III, 359.
[4]*Ibid.*
[5]P., III, 359.

> How comes thy soule so little?

he replies:

> I did exercise too much with a liuely Spirit.[6]

His zeal, which has a chance to manifest itself only in speech, is very similar to that of Jonson's Ananias and Zeal-of-the-land Busy. He makes his entrance into hell with these militant words:

> Tis a burning zeale must consume the wicked, and therefore I will not bee kept out, but will chastize and correct the foule Fiend.[7]

Likewise revealing is his response to a noise outside, made by others of "his Synagogue," who have landed with him and who want to press into hell. He calls out:

> Let in the brethren, to confound this wicked assembly.[8]

The remaining characteristic to be considered is the only one he shares with all Puritans, regardless of type. A sneer at Puritan hypocrisy is evidently intended in the following dialogue between him and Minos:

> *Min.:* How camst thou lame and crooked, why do'st halt?
> *Pur.:* All the brethren and sisters for the better part are crooked, and halt: for my owne part, I neuer went vpright.[9]

Though the Puritans maintained an appearance of integrity and virtue, they were in reality, according to their enemies, monsters of iniquity. Their assumed piety was merely a covering to delude the credulous. This Puritan, who "neuer went vpright," is the fleshly embodiment of their spiritual deformity.

It is worth noting that the Puritan, with the possible exceptions of Guy Fawkes, the infamous hero of the Gunpowder Plot, and Bartervile, a usurer, is considered the

---

[6]P., III, 358.
[7]*Ibid.*
[8]P., III, 359.
[9]P., III, 359.

worst of the spirits that appear before the court of hell. Others of the damned are treated in a friendly, pleasant fashion, as if they have reached a place of good fellowship, even though in torture. At the worst, the attitude of the judges and their aides is impersonal and detached, the trial and condemnation seeming merely a matter of routine. But the Puritan arouses a feeling of unwonted excitement, even horror. When he enters, Shackle-soule informs Minos that "this blacke *Incubus*" was "an Arch-great Puritane once." All present cry out in alarm: "Ha! How! a Puritane?"[10] They show similar excitement at the news that numbers of other Puritans have come with this one. And when Pluto asks, "Are they all so blacke as he is?" they answer with one accord, "Worse."[11] Even before the other Puritans clamor to come in, Minos has already decided that the first one will make a dangerous inhabitant of hell and orders him "thrust . . . out at hell gates."[12] The threat of the other Puritans' presence increases the danger of the situation. So great a crisis is imminent, in fact, that the session of hell's court, in spite of its crowded docket, breaks up precipitately. Pluto announces:

> Rise therefore, away;
> Keepe the Iurie of brokers till our next court day.

In accordance with his instructions the herald of the court cries out:

> O yes! Sessions is deferd
> Because of Puritanes, Hell cannot be cleerd.[13]

The fact is worth emphasizing that this violent satire is directed against Puritans of the Separatist type. They are thrust out of hell, not because they are too virtuous to remain there, but because, by implication at least, they are too

---

[10]P., III, 358.

[11]*Ibid.*

[12]P., III, 359.

[13]*Ibid.* The possibility of a double meaning in the last line should not be overlooked.

wicked. Spirits so iniquitous, as well as so factious, cannot be permitted residence in an orderly, honest, meritorious place like hell.

Ampedo, in *Old Fortunatus*, is thoughtful, of a moralizing turn. Though his moralizing is not primarily puritanical, much of it being of a type common enough in Elizabethan and earlier writings, it reveals a seriousness of outlook by no means incongruous with the actual Puritan characteristics that crop out occasionally, mainly in contrast to the frivolity of his brother Andelocia. He quietly rebukes Andelocia for too rapturous an interest in the gay revels of Fortunatus:

> Why, brother, are not all these vanities?[14]

The phrasing has a suggestive ring of Puritanism. When, after the death of Fortunatus, Ampedo protests against the violation of their father's will, Andelocia calls him puritanical:

> A Puritan!—keep a dead man's will?[15]

Ampedo's speech of resigned acquiescence to his brother's determined purpose savors not a little of the Puritan:

> Do you as you please, the sin shall not be mine.
> Fools call those things profane that are divine.[16]

The last evidence of Puritanism comes when Ampedo attempts to restrain Andelocia and Shadow from an orgy of celebration over the recovery of the purse and the wishing hat. Andelocia replies impatiently to his brother's remonstrance:

> Away with your purity, brother, y'are an ass.[17]

Though Parenthesis, in *West-ward Hoe*, merely adopts the disguise of a Puritan and is given only superficial

---

[14]M., p. 327.
[15]M., p. 334.
[16]*Ibid.*
[17]M., p. 375.

characterization as such, it is advisable to consider him as a Puritan figure not only because of the few significant traits he is shown to possess, but also because of the slight Puritan background of the whole play.[18]

The clearest evidence that Parenthesis is a Puritan is furnished by Mrs. Honisuckle's designation of him as "a kind of Precision."[19] His most characteristic trait seems to be hypocrisy, though it is completely without the sinister implications inherent in the hypocrisy of Jonson's Puritans. In the enthusiastic account of Parenthesis that she gives to Mrs. Tenterhooke, Mrs. Honisuckle actually urges his hypocrisy as one of his merits, though she does not call it by name:

> By my troth if thou beest a good wench let him teach thee, thou mayst send him of any arrant, and trust him with any secret; nay, to see how demurely he will beare himselfe before our husbands, and how iocond when their backes are turn'd.[20]

There are other evidences of the capacity of Parenthesis for playing the Puritan and the rogue at the same time. In one scene, after he has talked very gravely to Mr. Honisuckle, he proceeds, when he and Judith Honisuckle are alone, to enumerate glorious and abundant opportunities for mischief. He concludes his long speech by saying:

> Why, euen now must you and I hatch an egge of iniquity.[21]

Judith, by no means ill pleased, answers:

---

[18]I have not attempted to reach an independent conclusion as to the shares of authorship in *West-ward Hoe.* Critical opinion seems to assign to Dekker by far the greater part in this play, as well as in *North-ward Hoe,* particularly in the London scenes. As they are all that are pertinent to my discussion, I have proceeded on the assumption that the character and actions of Parenthesis are Dekker's. For a discussion of the question see E. E. Stoll, *John Webster* (Boston, 1905); A. C. Swinburne, *The Age of Shakespeare* (London, 1909); Mary Leland Hunt, *Thomas Dekker: A Study* (New York, 1911).

[19]P., II, 292.

[20]*Ibid.*

[21]P., II, 299.

Troth maister I thinke thou wilt proue a very knaue.[22]

He tacitly admits the charge against himself and openly admits its application to his fellows:

Its the fault of many that fight vnder this band.[23]

The same characteristic is implied in a later scene when Parenthesis makes similar suggestions and Judith answers: "Ah thou vngodly maister."[24] A later conversation between Mrs. Tenterhooke and Mrs. Wafer furnishes further evidence of Parenthesis' powers of dissimulation:

Clare: That wagge (our schoolemaister) Maister *Parenthesis* . . . I remember he said grace, methinks I see him yet, how he turn'd vp the white a'th eie, when he came to the last Gaspe, and that he was almost past Grace.

Mabell: Nay he can doot.[25]

It must be admitted that in spite of what the women say of the behavior of Parenthesis before their husbands, he does not conduct himself like a Puritan. He talks gravely and learnedly of his pupils' progress in their studies, but, as a rule, neither in speech nor in manner is he like a Puritan. Only twice does he slip into Puritan speech: once he uses the word *verily*[26] and once the word *edifie*[27] in a significant sense.

Two possible reasons suggest themselves for Dekker's device of a Puritan's disguise, rather than some other. In the first place, considering the prevailing conception of

---

[22]*Ibid.*

[23]P., II, 299. Judith's answer to this statement has no important application to Parenthesis, but may be mentioned as perhaps emphasizing the prevalent conception of Puritan hypocrisy: "I shall loue a Puritans face the worse whilest I liue for that Coppy of thy countenance."

[24]P., II, 311.

[25]P., II, 342–3. It should be noted that two additional Puritan characteristics are given Parenthesis in this speech: his saying grace, presumably a long one, and his turning up the whites of his eyes.

[26]P., II, 295.

[27]*Ibid.*

Puritan hypocrisy, it is convenient for Parenthesis, allowing for divergence between precept and practice. Secondly, such a disguise will gain for Parenthesis ready entrance into the homes of these prosperous merchants, who, I think, are meant to be considered as substantial Puritan citizens, in the economic sense. Though the Puritan element is slight, it is sufficient to justify this opinion. Mrs. Honisuckle speaks of going to Puritan lectures.[28] Mrs. Wafer betrays herself as a Puritan in one scene by her ejaculation of "indeed la."[29] So, though the three citizens and their wives are merry folk, much more interested in making money and having a good time than in establishing the kingdom of God on earth, they are meant to be presented against a Puritan middle-class background.

In spite of the fact that in Simon Eyre of *The Shoemakers' Holiday* Dekker is portraying a historical figure of the early fifteenth century, long before Puritans as a class came into existence, I believe that he intends this play, too, to represent a Puritan environment. A Simon Eyre of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century would very likely have been a prosperous Puritan citizen of the sort politically and commercially important in the city of London. With the customary Elizabethan indifference to anachronisms, Dekker doubtless thought of this rollicking shoemaker and his family in terms of the citizens he knew at first hand.

The suggestion of Puritan background lies in occasional speeches of Margery, Simon's wife, and of his apprentices. Margery does not attach any strictly religious significance to what she says, as is to be plainly seen, but some of the scriptural phrases of the Puritans slip from her too naturally to be disregarded. Once, in talking to Hodge, she employs literal quotation from the Bible, saying, "Indeed, all flesh is grass,"[30] and a little later:

---

[28]P., II, 292.

[29]P., II, 357. Cf. Dekker's phrase "the *Indeede-la* of a Puritanicall Citizen," in *The Wonderfull Yeare*, G., I, 78.

[30]M., p. 41.

> Fie, upon it, how costly this world's calling is; perdy, but that it is one of the wonderful works of God, I would not deal with it.[31]

To Ralph, who congratulates her upon her good health, she says: "Yea, truly, Ralph, I thank my Maker,"[32] and later adds, quite irrelevantly:

> Thou knowest that naked we came out of our mother's womb, and naked we must return; and, therefore, thank God for all things.[33]

Ralph and Hodge, for their part, sprinkle their speech with enough *forsooths* to strengthen the impression of a Puritan background.

A curious representation of a Puritan is Roger, servant to Bellafront, the courtesan in *The Honest Whore, Part I.* Both the evidence and the characterization are slight. Roger is a light-hearted lad, on terms of perfect understanding with his mistress. He is a sort of perverted Puritan, using Puritan words with an entirely flippant meaning. When a group of gallants who have come to see Bellafront, ask for a light, Roger answers them in inappropriately pious phrase:

> We that live here in this vale of misery are as dark as hell.[34]

His chief Puritan term is *forsooth,* which he uses in almost every speech he utters. In view of his role in the play, his words alone would hardly distinguish him as a Puritan; the impression of his Puritan antecedents is confirmed by Bellafront herself, who, in assumed anger, soundly berates him as an "ungodly puritanical creature."[35]

There is nothing in Roger's behavior to warrant his being called puritanical, nor is any satire of general Puritan characteristics discernible in Bellafront's remark. The implication is, probably, that Roger, though not a Puritan in character, comes from the social stratum with which

---

[31] *Ibid.*
[32] M., p. 42.
[33] M., p. 43.
[34] M., p. 119.
[35] M., p. 122.

the Puritan class was associated—perhaps from some of the humbler families of tradespeople such as inhabited Blackfriars, and that he betrays his Puritan origin in the tricks of speech that still cling to him. The frequency with which he uses the word *forsooth* is evidently intended to be of some significance, and Bellafront's epithet suggests the explanation.

In both plays and pamphlets incidental allusions to Puritanism are predominantly social.[36] The most abundant

---

[36]No references to the political aspect of Puritanism occur in either plays or pamphlets. An apparent exception is the last act of *The Sun's Darling*, where three clowns guilty of democratic sentiments and openly critical of royalty, are rebuked for their "rebellious mindes," for their attempt to found "rebellion upon conscience." The whole scene is an attempt to give an extravagant compliment to the youthful Charles I. Critical opinion seems unanimous, however, in attributing this part of the play to Ford. See W. Macneile Dixon, "Chapman, Marston, Dekker," *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (New York, 1933), VI, 33–65; A. C. Swinburne, "John Ford," *The Fortnightly Review* (July, 1871), pp. 55–57; P., I, xl, IV, 445.

References in the plays to the religious aspect of Puritanism are almost negligible. For only three can positive significance be claimed, and they cannot be considered of any real importance. Two consist merely in names of Puritan churches. Hodge, in *The Shoemakers' Holiday*, says that coins are jingling in his pockets "like St. Mary Overy's bells." (M., p. 29.) A man comments on the shrewishness of his wife by saying that

> sh'has a tongue will be herd further in a still
> morning then Saint Antlings-bell.
> (P., III, 159.)

John of Leyden, "this Dutch botcher," is mentioned by name in *Old Fortunatus* (M., p. 300). Conjectural significance can be ascribed to this sentence from *Match mee in London:* "I saw a doue fly by that had eaten Carrion it shewd like a corrupted Churchman." (P., IV, 154.) The justification for including it here is that the chief protests against abuses in the church came from Puritans, who saw

relate to hypocrisy, chiefly of the sort satirized in Jonson's plays: a pious exterior which is used as a cloak to vicious or dishonest practices. Such a conception is expressed ironically in *West-ward Hoe,* in a conversation between Mrs. Tenterhooke and Sergeant Ambush:

Amb.: I know most of the knaues about London, and most of the Theeues to, I thanke God, and good intelligence.

Mrs. T.: I wonder thou dost not turne Broker then.

Amb.: Pew; I haue bin a Broker already; for I was first a Puritan, then a Banquerout, then a Broker, then a Fencer, and then Sergeant, were not these Trades woulde make a man honest?[37]

The same conception is suggested, though not so obviously, in a passage from *If this be not a good Play, the Diuell is in it,* in which Bartervile, a usurer, explains his motive for a certain action:

> That, for which manie their Religion,
> Most men their Faith, all chaunge their honestie,
> *Profite,* (that guilded god) *Commoditie.*
> Hee that would grow damnd-Rich, yet live secure,
> Must keepe a case of Faces, sometimes demure.
> Sometimes a grum-surly sir, now play the Jewe,
> Then the Precisian; Not a man weele viewe.
> But varies so.[38]

The harshest satire occurs in the identification of hypocrisy with Anabaptism, a conception made familiar by Jonson's plays:

Hypocrisie was put to nurse to an *Anabaptist* of *Amsterdam* . . . So that béeing ripe for maisters, *Hypocrisie* was presently bound to a Puritane Taylor, by his Nurse, and did nothing but make Clokes of Religion for to weare, of a thousand colours . . . From Italy hee came into the *Low-countries,* where he would not talke, vnlesse hee

---

in some of the corrupt practices certain evils of Catholicism that the Reformation had not purged away.

Various passages in the pamphlets are suggestive of the religious aspect of Puritanism, but since they are of importance for a discussion of Dekker's attitude, I shall postpone reference to them.

[37] P., II, 315–6.

[38] P., III, 322.

dranke with him, and call you *Myn Leeuin Broder*, with a full glasse, onely to ouerreach you in your cups of your bargaine.[39]

Similar invective is found in the description of a Politick Bankrupt:

Sometimes hee's a Puritane . . . and wrapping his crafty Serpents body in the cloake of Religion, he does those acts that would become none but a Diuell.[40]

Though the ensuing passage satirizes Puritan dishonesty more clearly than hypocrisy, I quote it here because of its implications of hypocrisy and because of its similarity to references in plays of the period, especially Jonson's, where sanctity is made a cloak to various kinds of knavery. In a contention between two actors as to their relative merits, one asks the other to prove his excellence by enumerating the parts he has played, and the following conversation takes place:

Mary saies the other, I haue so naturally playd the Puritaine, that many tooke me to be one. True saies the first agen, thou playdst the Puritane so naturally, that thou couldst neuer play the honest man afterwards.[41]

The same conception is more directly expressed in a description of various orders of thieves. Of a Rogue who pretends to be a cripple for the sake of getting alms, Dekker says: "No puritane can discemble more than he."[42]

Although most of the references to Puritan hypocrisy in Elizabethan drama make financial dishonesty the basis of the satire, a few concern themselves with personal conduct. One allusion of this kind occurs in *West-ward Hoe*,

---

[39]*A Strange Horse-Race*, G., III, 358–9. Although allowance must be made for national prejudice against the commercial astuteness of the Dutch, it is significant that the underlying avarice of Dekker's Dutch Anabaptist is very similar to that of Ananias, Anabaptist from Amsterdam, in *The Alchemist*.

[40]*The Seuen Deadly Sinnes of London*, G., II, 21.

[41]*Iests to Make You Merrie*, G., II, 282.

[42]*The Belman of London*, G., III, 95.

where Birdlime, a bawd, marshals her most convincing arguments to entice Mrs. Justiniano into unfaithfulness:

> If your husband haue giuen vp his Cloake, let another take measure of you in his Ierkin: for as the Cobler, in the night time walks with his Lanthorne, the Merchant, and the Lawyer with his Link, and the Courtier with his Torch: So euery lip has his Lettice to himselfe: the Lob has his Lasse, the Collier his Dowdy . . . the Seruing-man his Punke, the Student his Nun in white Fryers, the Puritan his Sister, and the Lord his Lady: which worshipfull vocation may fall vppon you, if youle but strike whilest the Iron is hot.[43]

The Puritans' designation of themselves by the terms "sisters" and "brethren" was the target of much scorn, not a little of which suggested the irregular relationship implied in the foregoing passage. Another reference is likewise clearly directed at the obliquity of which the Puritans, under a pretense of piety, were presumed by their enemies to be guilty. It occurs in *The Seuen Deadly Sinnes of London,* under the heading of Nocturnal Triumph, the purpose being to show the villainy possible at night:

> Nay, the sober *Perpetuana* suited Puritane, that dares not (so much as by Moone-light) come neere the Suburb-shadow of a house where they set stewed Prunes before you; raps as boldly at the hatch, when he knowes *Candle-light* is within, as if he were a new chosen Constable.[44]

A similar reference, though perhaps intended to be taken literally, at least contains implications of Puritan hypocrisy. It describes *"what armor a harlot weares comming out of the Suburbes to besiege the Citty within the wals":*

---

[43]P., II, 307.

[44]G., II, 44. A passage from *The Dead Tearme* contains a similar implication in regard to the Puritan's moral code, though it is unconnected with hypocrisy. It is part of the pamphlet in which Dekker makes a complaint regarding the condition of the brothels on the Bankside. He lists the former enactments of Parliament, and accompanies each enactment with a marginal note intended to reveal actual contemporary conditions. He says: "*Seauenthly,* that no *Stewholder* was to giue entertainment to any Woman of any order in Religion, or to any man's wife." His marginal note reads: "*Aswell Puritane as Protestant are welcome.*" (G., IV, 57.)

Vpon what perch then does she sit? what part plaies she then? onely the Puritane. If before she ruffled in silkes, now is she more ciuilly attired then a Mid-wife.[45]

The two remaining references are less clear in their suggestion of hypocrisy. It is probable that *precize* in the following passage has Puritan significance:

> Tush. Resolu'st thou to do ill: be not precize
> Who writes of *Vertue* best, are slaues to vize.[46]

A phrase difficult to interpret occurs in *The Witch of Edmonton.* Near the close of the play Mother Sawyer, the witch, is surprised to find that the black dog, her "familiar," has become white. He tells her that his changed color is a sign of her impending defeat. She enters a spirited protest:

> Thou'rt a lying spirit:
> Why to mine eyes art thou a flag of truce?
> I am at peace with none; 'tis the black colour,
> Or none, which I fight under: I do not like
> Thy puritan paleness; glowing furnaces
> Are far more hot than they which flame outright.[47]

There may be nothing of real significance in the word *puritan,* the whole passage merely expressing the common conception of black as a sign of deviltry and white as a sign of purity and innocence.[48] Two lines from a poem by Lyly, however, suggest that by an extension of meaning white might occasionally be linked with hypocrisy:

---

[45]*Lanthorne and Candle-Light,* G., III, 268.

[46]*West-ward Hoe,* P., II, 335.

[47]M., p. 462.

[48]Cf. the statement of Iago in *Othello:*

> When devils will the blackest sins put on
> They do suggest at first with heavenly shows,
> As I do now.
> (II, iii, 357–9.)

See also Don Cameron Allen's "Symbolic Color in the Literature of the Renaissance," *Philological Quarterly,* XV (October, 1936), 81–92.

> Giue me black silk y[t] sable suites my hart
> & yet som white though white words do deceiue.[49]

In view of the common association of hypocrisy with Puritans, it is possible that the implication in the phrase from Lyly may lie also in Mother Sawyer's comment on "puritan paleness."

Abundant also are references to the Puritan attitude towards swearing, six occurring in plays and pamphlets. In *If this be not a good Play, the Diuell is in it,* Bartervile, the usurer, claims that he has paid to Far.[50] two hundred crowns, which Far. denies having received. Bartervile is forced to take oath that he has paid the money; immediately after doing so he falls to the ground, grievously stricken. Far. comments:

> The diuels turn'd puritane I feare,
> He hates (me thinkes) to heare his own child sweare.[51]

Though the family of Carter, a rich yeoman in *The Witch of Edmonton,* are not otherwise represented as Puritans, his daughter Susan emphasizes to one of her suitors their attitude towards swearing:

> Good sir, no swearing; yea and nay with us
> Prevail above all oaths you can invent.[52]

A more direct reference is made when Andelocia, in *Old Fortunatus,* makes a pun on his family's poverty:

> Now we can all three swear like Puritans at one bare word.[53]

To warn the inhabitants of London against being swindled, Dekker describes a Cheater, in part, by comparing his speech with a Puritan's, saying that he will seldom swear,

---

[49]R. Warwick Bond, ed., *The Complete Works of John Lyly* (Oxford, 1902), III, 473.

[50]The text of the play is imperfect. The full name of this character is nowhere given, and neither his identity nor his function in the play is made clear.

[51]P., III, 316.

[52]M., p. 401.

[53]M., p. 305.

but if hee sweare, you would take him for a puritane, for his oathes are, *Of Honesty, of Troth, by Saint Martin* &c.[54]

A Politick Bankrupt is likewise to be distinguished by his Puritan speech:

He sweares by nothing but Indéede, or rather does not sweare at all.[55]

Such mildness is also indicated in the phrase "the *Indeede-la* of a Puritanicall Citizen."[56]

Another group of allusions I have placed under the general heading of personal qualities of the Puritans. Six refer to conduct, six to appearance or mannerisms. The high moral standards of the Puritans, which, inconsistently enough, the dramatists at times refused to recognize as sincere, are referred to three times, all in connection with some woman's rejection of a man's advances. After the reformation of Bellafront, in *The Honest Whore, Part II,* a gallant says scornfully of her: "Your puritanical honest whore sits in a blue gown."[57] Tormiella, in *Match mee in London,* who refuses in strong terms to become the Spanish King's mistress, is straightway addressed by the king's bawd as "thou puritan foole."[58]

Greeneshield, in *North-ward Hoe,* baffled by the fidelity of Maybery's wife, threatens to be revenged upon her "puritanicall coynesse."[59]

Closely related to the strictness of the Puritan moral code was the sobriety of demeanor, which seems to be

---

[54]*The Belman of London,* G., III, 121.

[55]*The Seuen Deadly Sinnes of London,* G., II, 21.

[56]*The Wonderfull Yeare,* G., I, 78. Cf. Mrs. Wafer's use of the phrase in *West-ward Hoe,* P., II, 357.

[57]M., p. 268. Courtesans who were doing penance or undergoing punishment were required to wear a blue gown. Bellafront, through some misunderstanding regarding her reformation, has been carried off to Bridewell, the place of punishment for such women.

[58]P., IV, 161.

[59]P., III, 3.

indirectly referred to in *Old Fortunatus*, when Andelocia tries to revive Ampedo's low spirits in these words:

> Thou hast looked very devilishly ever since the good angel left thee: come, come, leave this broad-brim fashions; because the world frowns upon thee, wilt not thou smile upon us?[60]

The significance of the passage lies partly in the phrase "broad-brim fashions" and partly in the fact that Ampedo is to some extent characterized as a Puritan in the play. Of one of the messengers the devil sends to Pierce Penniless, it is said: "He strives to speake soberly, grauely, and like a Puritane."[61] The reference to the "sober . . . suited Puritane"[62] presumably characterizes the Puritan's behavior as well as his dress.

To the personal peculiarities of the Puritans that gave Jonson such opportunities for ridicule, Dekker pays little attention. Puritan speech is mocked briefly and good-naturedly in the facetious designation of "two Virginall Iacks" as "two wicked elders."[63] It is made one of the characteristics of Margery and the apprentices in *The Shoemakers' Holiday* and of Roger in *The Honest Whore, Part I.*[64] The Puritan habit of casting the eyes towards heaven is satirized in a cynical reflection upon the supposed chastity of women:

> Walls of chastitie? walls of wafer-cakes, I haue
> Knowne a woman carry a fether-bed, and a man in't
> In her minde, when in the streete she cast up the white of
> Her eye like a Puritane.[65]

---

[60]M., p. 306. The *New English Dictionary* defines "broad-brim" as a nickname for one who wears such a hat; a Quaker. The Quaker sect had not been formed at the time *Old Fortunatus* was written, but the allusion to Puritans seems unmistakable. The only adjective listed is *broad-brimmed*, no use of which is recorded before 1688.

[61]*Newes from Hell*, G., II, 90.

[62]*The Seuen Deadly Sinnes of London*, G., II, 44.

[63]*North-ward Hoe*, P., III, 14.

[64]See pp. 92–93 of this paper.

[65]*The Wonder of a Kingdome*, P., IV, 227.

It will be remembered that one distinguishing mark of Parenthesis as a Puritan was his habit of casting up the whites of his eyes.[66] Two references are made to the short hair of the Puritan, both from *The Gvls Horne-Booke.* Dekker tells the gull the advantages of long hair,

> whose length before the rigorous edge of any puritanicall paire of scizzers should shorten the breadth of a finger, let the three huswifely spinsters of Destiny rather curtall the thread of thy life.[67]

The second does not designate Puritans by name, but the inference is plain, in view of the preceding passage and of an identical phrase in Jonson:

> Experience cries out in euery Citty, that those self-same Criticall *Saturnists,* whose hair is shorter then their eye-brows, take a pride to haue their hoary beards hang slauering like a dozen of Foxetailes downe so low as their middle.[68]

There occur a few references to such religious practices of the Puritans as would make them a target for social ridicule. A significant allusion to their zeal is found in *The Honest Whore, Part I,* during a scene in which the Duke of Milan inquires of an attendant at Bethlehem Hospital regarding the patients' chances of recovery. The attendant answers:

> Why, according to the quantity of the moon that's got into 'em. An alderman's son will be mad a great while, a very great while, especially if his friends left him well; a whore will hardly come to her wits again: a puritan, there's no hope of him, unless he may pull down the steeple, and hang himself i'th' bell-ropes.[69]

The suggestion of a Puritan zeal that accomplishes nothing lies in the following comment:

---

[66] *West-ward Hoe,* P., II, 342–3. See p. 92 of this paper.

[67] G., II, 226.

[68] G., II, 228. See Jonson's *Every Man out of His Humour,* "After the second Sounding," ll. 42–3, and *Eastward Hoe,* V, ii, 55. (*Ben Jonson,* ed. by C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, five volumes, Oxford, 1927–37.)

[69] M., p. 178.

Talke and make a noise, no matter to what purpose, I haue learn'd that with going to puritan Lectures.[70]

An allusion to zeal is implicit in the promise of one character to defend a lie "stifly; as a Puritan does contention."[71] Follie, in *The Sun's Darling,* remarks as follows on Humor's suggestions for the entertainment of Prince Raybright:

Here's humor in the right trim, a few more such toies would make the little world of man runne mad, as the *Puritan* that sold his conscience for a May pole.[72]

The long grace of the Puritan is perhaps referred to when Dekker speaks of

an Epistle iust the length of a Hench-mans grace before dinner, which is long inough for any booke in conscience, vnlesse the writer be vnreasonable.[73]

A possible allusion to Sunday observance occurs in *Old Fortunatus,* in a speech of Andelocia to Agripyne, whom he has forcibly carried away from her native land:

If you think but a crabbed thought of me, the spirit that carried you in mine arms through the air, will tell me all; therefore set your Sunday face upon't.[74]

The inclusion of the passage is perhaps justified by the suggestion of Puritan insistence on a Sabbath consecrated to sobriety of demeanor and holiness of thought.

To Puritans in their economic capacity there is one definite reference, besides another of doubtful significance. In *West-ward Hoe,* when the three citizens' wives resolve to trick the gallants with whom they have gone to Brentford, one says:

---

[70]*West-ward Hoe,* P., II, 292.

[71]*North-ward Hoe,* P., III, 186.

[72]P., IV, 327. The passage also applies clearly to the Puritan attitude towards pleasure. I have included it under zeal because it suggests Puritan sensitiveness of conscience and the zeal resulting from such sensitiveness.

[73]*Lanthorne and Candle-light,* G., III, 240–1.

[74]M., p. 356.

> Be . . . as fantasticke and light headed to the eye, as fethermakers, but as pure about the heart, as if we dwelt amongst em in Black Fryers.[75]

In the same play Mrs. Honisuckle speaks of some person's being "as Stale as a Country Ostes, an Exchange Sempster, or a Court Landresse."[76] The allusion has, of course, no direct reference to Puritans; it has a claim to be included because in some plays of the period such occupations are connected with Puritans.[77]

Two remaining references to Puritans are difficult to classify. One is of no significance except to indicate that the Puritan was a familiar type among the London throngs. Dekker merely mentions the Puritan in the long list of figures to be seen always in Paul's Walk, including him among such Londoners as "the Appel-squire, the Lawyer, the Vsurer, the Cittizen, the Bankerout, the Scholler," and, whether by design or accident, placing him in closest conjunction with the Cheater and the Cut-throat.[78] The second of the two references consists of the fifth jest in *Iests to Make You Merrie:*

> A Mad country Parson inuiting certaine of his friends to the eating of a tyth pigge and some other good cheere, one of / the guests brought along with him a Precisian (which sect the parson neuer could abide) and hauing caru'd once or twice to the rest, at length he cald aloud in Latin to the Precisian (for he tooke him to be a scholler, because he went all in blacke).[79]

The Latin phrases of the parson are made to sound very much like English vulgarity. That is the opinion of the Precisian, who,

> blessing himselfe to thinke that a Churchman should vtter such filthy words (as he construes them) rose from the board and departed, reprouing the Parson for a beastly and vnmannerly christian.

---

[75]P., II, 345.

[76]P., II, 291.

[77]See especially Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid in the Mill* (*Dramatic Works*, ed. by A. R. Waller and Arnold Glover, Cambridge, 1905–12), I, iii.

[78]*The Dead Tearme*, G., IV, 51.

[79]G., II, 275–6.

The conclusion of the jest explains the objectionable words in terms of the food upon the table. There appear to be several Puritan qualities satirized in this tale: Puritan ignorance and suspicion of Latin, prudishness in personal conduct, the preaching tendency—or at least the tendency of the Puritan to consider himself a guardian of public and private morals. Perhaps a Puritan was made the butt of the jest because he, more than any other type, possessed the combination of qualities that made him a suitable target. Perhaps too there is an implication of the derision in which the Puritans were held; certainly the parson, who "neuer could abide" the sect, chose an expeditious way of getting rid of his unwelcome guest.

II

Merely a superficial reading of Dekker's plays and pamphlets is sufficient to reveal an inconsistency in his attitude towards Puritanism.[80] There can be found vilification of Puritans as violent, though not so abundant, as Jonson's, coupled with a good-natured tolerance that Jonson never shows. At the other extreme is evidence of actual sympathy with the Puritans, even to Dekker's practical identification of his views with theirs. An attempt at reconciliation of these conflicting views would perhaps be futile, but they are at least susceptible of explanation. The variations in attitude can best be considered by separate discussion of the social material, in both plays and pamphlets, and of the religious material afforded by the pamphlets.

It is in the social aspect of Puritanism that there is the chief evidence of Dekker's unfavorable attitude. He makes satirical use of the same matter as do the other Elizabethan

---

[80]E. N. S. Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage* (New York, 1903), comments briefly on Dekker's attitude towards Puritanism, saying (p. 255) that Dekker's works abound in references to Puritans, though delicate satire is wanting. From the allusions he cites (pp. 219–20), he evidently considers Dekker's antagonism as too obvious to need discussion.

dramatists. He directs his chief attack at hypocrisy, especially the monstrous sort that is a cloak to evil practises. He derides the Puritans' zeal, comments in a few places on their attitude towards swearing, ridicules once their hatred of maypoles. Like some other dramatists, he presents an ugly picture of Puritan sexual immorality.[81] The only Puritan characterization that can be called complete or consistent is harshly satirical; though brief, it bears comparison with that of Jonson.

That all of these statements are true must be admitted. But they are not an expression of the whole truth, nor do they take account of certain circumstances that should be understood—circumstances that offer just as much evidence for Dekker's tolerance.

It should be pointed out, for instance, that the Puritan characterized in *If this be not a good Play, the Diuell is in it* is a Separatist. An attitude of contempt towards a Separatist is not necessarily inconsistent with tolerance, or even sympathy, towards moderate Puritans. If that Separatist is an Anabaptist, a reasonable presumption for Dekker's Puritan, the attitude of hostility is easy to understand. Calvin himself spoke of the necessity of defending Christ's Church against "all Idolaters and Hereticks, as Papists, Anabaptists, with such-like Limbs of Antichrist."[82]

Furthermore, such unfavorable characterization is offset by other figures who, though not so outspokenly designated as Puritans, nevertheless have Puritan traits. Towards them, Dekker is at least tolerant, if not actually sympathetic. Ampedo is the most admirable character in *Old Fortunatus;* his is the only restraining moral influence among the strictly human figures in the play. Margery Eyre,

---

[81]A. M. Myers, *Representation and Misrepresentation of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama* (Philadelphia, 1931), p. 22, points out the prevalence of such representation in Middleton and his followers.

[82]"Calvin's Common-Prayer Book: or, the Service, Discipline and Form of the Common-Prayers, and Administration of the Sacraments, us'd in the English Church of Geneva," *The Phenix: or, a Revival of Scarce and Valuable Pieces* (London, 1708), II, 208.

whose speech marks her as a Puritan, is clearly meant to make a claim upon our affections. Even the graceless Roger, in *The Honest Whore, Part I,* is merely made the source of a little merry comedy. Parenthesis, in *Westward Hoe,* is a reasonably likable figure.[83] Nobody takes him or his suggestions very seriously, and he is not persistent in his trivial villainies. Even his hypocrisy is made a sort of virtue, at least in the eyes of the women, the only ones who are aware of it. In fact, the lightness of tone in the whole comedy makes it almost impossible to attribute to Dekker anything but tolerance. For a final comment on Dekker's attitude as shown in his Puritan characters, it may be pointed out that, except in presenting the Separatist in hell, Dekker never employs one of the most effective methods of satire—that of making the character himself the mouthpiece of the ridicule. It is the method that Jonson uses with such deadly effect in the characterization of his major Puritan figures.

And apparently, after inveighing against the two vices of hypocrisy and sexual immorality, Dekker has exhausted his venom. He does not satirize many other vices, but mentions chiefly the Puritans' zeal and their attitude towards swearing. The three references to zeal are comparatively mild; there seems little evidence of anything more than good-natured ridicule. He does not concentrate attention on the absurdities of Puritan zeal, as does Jonson. He even treats the attitude towards swearing with some tenderness, as in Susan Carter's gentle insistence on the efficacy of "yea and nay." The personal peculiarities of the Puritans, one of the most fertile fields for satire, he leaves almost untouched. There occur two mild references to casting up the whites of the eyes, two to short hair—little more. The Puritan hatred of pleasure, which Dekker as a dramatist might be

---

[83]In my view of Parenthesis I differ with Stoll ("The Influence of Jonson on Dekker," *Modern Language Notes,* XXI (1906), 20–23), who considers Parenthesis a rather sinister figure, an "envious mischiefmaker" created after the pattern of Jonson's Macilente in *Every Man out of His Humour.*

expected to deride, is touched upon only once, and there not in emphatic terms.

The abundant material offered for a consideration of Dekker's attitude towards the religious aspect of Puritanism indicates almost wholly a favorable view. The only evidence of hostility lies in references to "error and schisme," in which he apparently included both Catholics and Separatists. His dislike finds frequent expression in his pamphlets, from which one quotation will suffice:

> Religion (all this while) a Garment wore,
> Stayn'd like a Painters Apron, and turn'd Whore.
> To seuerall Countries, till from deepe Abysme
> Vp her Two Bastards came (Error and Schisme),
> She in That motley Cloake, with her Two Twinnes,
> Trauell'd from land to land, sowing Ranck Sinnes,
> Which choak'd the Good Corne, and from them did rise
> Opinions, factions, black leau'd Heresies;
> Pride, Superstition, Rancor, Hate, Disdaine,
> So that (me thought) on earth no good did Reigne.[84]

In no other sense can Dekker be called antagonistic. And there is considerable evidence of sympathy with the very things the Puritans stood for. In some passages from the pamphlets Dekker sounds so much like a Puritan that we can almost imagine him issuing exhortations from a pulpit; the conditions he deplores are exactly those deplored, publicly, by the Puritans. One significant quotation may be given:

> For all the Kings Iniunction of Prayer and Fasting, yet on those very dayes (acceptable to God, were they truly kept, & comfortable to our soules) in some Churches you shall see empty Pewes, not filled as at first, not crowding, but sitting aloofe one from another, as if, whilest they cry, *Lord, haue mercy vpon vs*, the Plague were in the holy Temple amongst them. Where, if you looke into the Fields, looke into the Streets, looke into Tauernes, looke into Ale-houses; they are all merry, all iocund; no Plague frights them, no Prayers stir vp them, no Faste tyes them to obedience. In the Fieldes they are (in the time of that diuine celebration) walking, talking, laughing, toying and sporting together. In the Streets, blaspheming, selling,

[84] *Dekker his Dreame*, G., III, 15–6.

buying, swearing. In Tauernes, and Ale-houses, drinking, roaring, and surfetting: In these, and many other places, Gods Holy-day is their Worke-day; the Kings Fasting-day, their day of Riot.[85]

Dekker also shows himself in sympathy with the Puritans in his attitude towards pluralities, the holding of several church livings by one man. Several passages indicate his concern with that serious evil in the Anglican church. In *A Strange Horse-Race* he tells of a vicar whose race was an attempt to overtake four benefices all at one time. They outdistanced him for a while, but he finally got beyond them. He contracted, however, an incurable cold, so that he lost his voice; he grew so hoarse, in fact, that he never spoke afterwards to any purpose.[86] In a description of a boat-load of passengers bound for hell Dekker includes

Cleargy men so pursy and so windlesse, / with bearing three or foure Church liuings, that they could scarce speake.[87]

He may perhaps be referring to the same evil when he lists *"Dumb Ministers"* as attendants of Sloth in *The Seuen Deadly Sinnes of London;* he also speaks of such ministers as "Retayners that wear his [Sloth's] cloth."[88]

Less obvious evidence of Dekker's perhaps unconscious sympathy with the Puritans is his hatred of Catholicism. Anti-Catholic feeling is not of itself sufficient to mark Dekker as a Puritan in attitude, but its probable significance should not be overlooked. It was chiefly the Puritan element in the Established Church that showed the strongest hostility to Catholics; the changes insisted on by the Puritans were designed to lessen the taint of Romanism in ceremony and doctrine.[89] The intensity of Dekker's feel-

---

[85]*A Rod for Run-Awayes,* G., IV, 289–90.

[86]G., III, 342.

[87]*Newes from Hell,* G., II, 118.

[88]G., II, 56.

[89]I am not ignoring the fact that at one time much of the anti-Catholic feeling was political, arising from fear of Spanish dominance or a Catholic succession. The threat of Spanish supremacy, however, ended with the defeat of the Armada, ten years before

ings may be measured by both the quality and the quantity of his writings. He wrote, besides incidental allusions, a play and a pamphlet wholly directed against Catholics—*The Whore of Babylon* and *The Double PP: A Papist in Arms,* the latter of which is especially virulent.

Perhaps, as significant for Dekker's attitude, should also be mentioned his moralizing tendencies, though, since he lived in a moralizing age, they should not be given undue weight. Account should be taken, too, of the precedent already established by the pamphlets of Greene and Nashe. But even when allowance is made for these circumstances, the fact remains that Dekker's concern with specific evils of his world is strongly suggestive of Puritan fervor.[90]

If the inconsistencies of Dekker's attitude are quickly apparent upon examination, the reasons for them are not far to seek. Two explanations for his hostility may be suggested. In the first place, his occupation as a dramatist should account in part for such an attitude; the dramatist who would not feel some animus towards a group so antagonistic to his profession would be rare indeed. Secondly, it is obvious that much of Dekker's satire may

---

Dekker began to write; and his major writings came after the Protestant succession was an assured promise or a reality. It seems to me that the political motive has no bearing on the question of Dekker's attitude.

[90]As final evidence of Dekker's Puritan sympathies may be mentioned his Calvinistic leanings, suggested by Kate L. Gregg, *Thomas Dekker: A Study in Economic and Social Backgrounds* (Seattle, 1924), pp. 94–6. Miss Gregg considers that Dekker is linked to Calvinism by such beliefs as the absolute sovereignty of God, the depravity of man, the necessity of prayer and repentance, the vanity of this world, and the desirability of the world to come. In other respects she seems to think that Dekker's hostility to Puritanism is so obvious as to need no explanation, saying that his "antipathy to Puritans as the chief of heretics shines forth in almost every play and pamphlet." Her conclusion is as follows: "When Dekker thought of religion in connection with the state, he was a staunch Anglican; when he considered abuse in the church, he was a Puritan; when he considered the relations between man, God, and the universe, he was a Calvinist."

be called conventional. Even a cursory study of Elizabethan drama will disclose that, no matter how satire against the Puritans may vary in quantity and intensity, the material is essentially the same. Hypocrisy is the prevailing vice; Puritan speech differs little from play to play and from author to author; personal peculiarities are heightened to absurdity. The list might be extended at length. Individual dramatists may omit available materials for satire; rarely do they make additions to what may be called the body of Elizabethan satire against the Puritans. That Dekker was a conventional writer, eager to seize upon subjects acceptable to the public, needs no demonstration. To say this is no disparagement of Dekker. He had a felicitous vein of expression in both poetry and prose, which gives him an enviable place among Elizabethan writers; but for ideas he drew often from his contemporaries, utilizing from their writings what had already passed the test of popular acclaim. The popularity of the Puritans as objects of ridicule was too well established for Dekker to ignore.

Conjectures as to the reason for Dekker's tolerant or even favorable attitude readily suggest themselves. The most obvious is that Dekker's middle-class sympathies, too generally acknowledged to need discussion here, may presuppose at least some degree of Puritan sympathy. Though the Puritans in Elizabethan London are not to be invariably identified with the commercial middle classes, a considerable body of thrifty merchants were Puritans. It is difficult to believe that a writer who so staunchly defended the middle class could consistently defame the Puritans, of whom it was in large part composed.

Secondly, Dekker's genuinely religious nature, his moral earnestness, must have made him receptive to the best Puritan influences. What is more natural than that such a stimulus should have been offered by the Puritans, who, whatever may be said of their absurdities, represented the most significant spiritual force in the England that Dekker knew? This is not to say that Dekker, living in an age so

little given to analysis, was necessarily aware of such kinship. But the influence of Puritan sentiment afforded him an outlet of which, however unconsciously, he made eager use.

Again, part of Dekker's tolerance, at least, may lie in his very incapacity for satire. As Stoll points out, Dekker cannot "hit";[91] his plays that are supposedly satirical contain horse-play and raillery rather than satire. He was too good-natured to be a successful satirist. On the serious side, his fundamental sweetness made him incapable of bitterness, out of which satire may spring. Scanty as is the biographical information about him, it offers a record of adversity sufficient to have exhausted a less Job-like capacity for suffering than Dekker's. Since satire must proceed from an asperity of temper combined with a preponderantly intellectual outlook, qualities apparently lacking in Dekker, it is small wonder that we find in his writings no sustained harshness of invective against the Puritans.

---

[91] *John Webster*, p. 69.

THE LONDON VOCABULARY AND ITS ANTECEDENTS

By D. T. Starnes

Our earliest edition of the book whose title is used as the subject of this study was printed in London, about the year 1700.[1] Its title-page reads thus:

> The London Vocabulary. English and Latin: With the Principal Things in Picture. For the Use of Schools. [Woodcut] London: Printed by R. Tookey, for H. Walwyn, at the Golden Pyramide, in the Old Jury. The First Door, next the Poultrey.

The title-pages of later editions[2] vary this wording slightly, include the date of publication, and give the author's name as "James Greenwood Author of the *English-Grammar,* and (late) Sur-Master of St. Paul's School."

The obvious purpose of this little book was to give boys a working Latin vocabulary so that, as the author suggests, they may "enter upon the reading of Corderius, The Latin Testament, Erasmus, Aesop, Cato, Ovidii Tristi, &c."

As to the method, the author states in the Preface,

> I have made choice of the most Natural and Entertaining that the subject is capable of; and distributed Matters into such an Order that the Learner may at the same time and with the same Pains,

---

[1] A copy in the British Museum is dated, conjecturally, 1700. There is no date on the title-page. A third edition bears the date 1713. See A. G. Kennedy, *A Bibliography of the Writings on the English Language,* Cambridge and New Haven, 1927, p. 105, No. 2851. See, also, Nos. 2855, 2892, 2903, 2916, 5756, 5763, 5766, 5773, 5779, 5794, 5799.

[2] I have examined, besides the 1700? edition, copies of the 13th edition (1749) and the 19th (1785). The title-page of the 13th edition runs: The London Vocabulary English and Latin; Put into a New Method, proper to acquaint the learner with Things as well as Pure Latin Words. Adorned with Twenty-six Pictures. For the Use of Schools. . . . By James Greenwood, Author of the *English-Grammar,* and late Surmaster of St. Paul's School. London. . . . MDCCLIX. See the *DNB* for a brief account of James Greenwood (d. 1737).

with the Knowledge of the Words, understand the things themselves which they express, with their Order and Dependance upon one another. And the better to fix both upon the Memory of the young Readers, and to give them as clear an Idea as possible of what they learn, I have caused little Draughts and Pictures to be made of such Things as are known and distinguished by their outward Shapes, with References to the Words that mention them . . .

The London Vocabulary consists of thirty-three chapters or topics, under each of which are grouped words immediately related to or suggested by the general topic; as under *fire,* for example, are a *spark, smoke, flame, soot,* a *fire-brand, a live coal, a dead coal, ashes, cinders.* The subjects thus grouped have a wide range. They extend from God, heaven, the planets, through the four elements of fire, air, water, earth; the things on the earth, as man, the parts of the body, the mind, diseases, clothes, food and drink, man's activities and institutions—including agriculture, warfare, and funerals—beasts, birds, fishes, herbs, trees; time, the seasons, stopping short of the Judgment Day, but suggesting a principle of presentation analogous to that in the first two chapters of Genesis.

Specifically, the chapter-topics as arranged in *The London Vocabulary* are thus: (1) Of Things (including God, heaven, the sun and moon, etc.), (2) Of the Elements, (3) Of Minerals and Metals, (4) Of Plants, (5) Of Trees and Shrubs, (6) Of Insects, (7) Of Birds, (8) Of Fishes, (9) Of Beasts, (10) Of Man, Age, Kindred, (11) Of the Parts of Man's Body, (12) Of the Bones, (13) Of Diseases, (14) Of the Mind and Its Affections, (15) Of Meats, and Drinks, (16) Of Apparel, (17) Of Buildings, (18) Of Household Stuff, (19) Of the Country and Country Affairs, (20) Of Societies, (21) The School, (22) Of the Church or Ecclesiastical Affairs, (23) Of Judicial Matters, (24) Of Warfare or Military Matters, (25) Of Sea or Naval Affairs, (26) Of Time—and seven other chapters concerned with the parts of speech, excepting nouns.

The lists of words under a general topic are arranged in parallel columns on the page, the English before the Latin; but the columns are broken at intervals by a link

word or phrase, indicating the relation of small groups of words each to the other and to the general topic. Under the heading of "Of Judicial Matters," for example, the arrangement is as follows:

In Government there are	
A Law 1	Lex, ĕgis f.
An Example	Exemplum, i, n.
In Law there are	
A Judge 2	Judex, īcis, m. & f.
A Counsellor 3	Consultor, ōris, m.
A Witness 4	Testis, is, m. & f.
The Judge hath for Writing	
A Secretary, or Scribe	Scrība, ae, f.
For speaking public	
A cryer	Praeco, ōnis, m.
For executing the Sentence	
A Hangman	Carnifex, īcis, m. . . .
Or Jack Ketch 5	

Though the links here appear at more frequent intervals than in most chapters, they exemplify the author's attempt to give a sort of coherence to his vocabulary.

One of the most interesting features of this little book is the illustrations or the draughts and pictures referred to above. Immediately underneath each general heading, and occupying about one-third of the page, is a composite cut designed to illustrate the topic. In each picture the numbers correspond to numbered words in the vocabulary which follows. To refer again to the chapter "Of Judicial Matters," the rectangular cut consists of two parts. The longer part shows a section of a court room with a judge ("1") seated at a desk on the dais, leaving through a law book ("2"); somewhat below and to the left is a counsellor ("3") obviously addressing the judge; and to the left of the lawyer is a witness ("4"). The second half of the picture is even more suggestive—it is a portion of the jail yard. In the background a barred window is visible; in front and below is a gallows against which leans a long ladder. Just above the ladder and astride the horizontal beam of the gallows

is a villainous looking person with long hair and a large hat, who in the Latin is called *carnifex*, in the English Jack Ketch ("5") or Hangman. Jack's business apparently is to cut the rope and free the corpse of the thief ("6") which dangles from the beam. An impressive lesson for young schoolboys.

Of almost equal interest is the illustration of the topic "Of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Affairs" (XXII). Here is a cross-section of the church and the churchyard. In the background are a tomb, near which is a newly dug grave. Below and in front is a procession led by a priest. They are pallbearers carrying a black coffin to the church, where the bishop in his pulpit awaits them. The grave, the coffin, the attendants are all duly numbered, and thus refer to the word-list following, where the student may find the English and Latin names for them.

But not all the illustrations run to the gruesome or the bizarre, though it may be added that under "Diseases," which shows a doctor standing by the bedside of his patient, a table with several small phials of simples on it, and, in the foreground, an apothecary or chemist with mortar and pestle concocting a remedy, is not without an ominous suggestion. The picture of the school room with pupils reciting; or that of Man, presented on a stile, male on one side and female on the other, so as to indicate the different levels from infancy to old age were doubtless more attractive to young boys than was the grim business of Jack Ketch.

More suggestive of composite illustrations found in present-day dictionaries is that in the *Vocabulary* under the Topic "Of Houshold Stuff." In this are twenty-four items, including pieces of furniture, kitchen utensils, etc.

What with the illustrations, the selections and grouping of words, the convenient format and cheapness of the text [one shilling] the *London Vocabulary* was an extremely popular book. It was reissued at fairly regular intervals in England from c. 1700 to 1816, the year when the 26th

edition[3] was published; and between 1787 and 1816 it went through at least four editions in America.

Though Greenwood states on the title-page[4] that his *Vocabulary* was "put into a New Method," and, by implication, was quite novel in the world of nomenclators and vocabularies, his statement cannot be taken seriously. Some of the immediate sources for content and method may be found in the late seventeenth century. But the tradition of which *The London Vocabulary* is a part is very old in European vocabularies, schoolbooks, and dictionaries; it goes back, indeed, for at least 700 years. The purpose of this study is to trace that tradition, to note modifications, and to suggest the possible significance of it.

Owing to the inaccessibility of many books and manuscripts, it is hardly practicable, if indeed desirable, to indicate every step in the long march across the centuries: it is possible, however, to chart the main highway, the important intersections and turns until the road leads finally to the door of James Greenwood, London, in the year 1700.

Our search for the antecedents of Greenwood takes us back to the tenth century—not to go further—to the Latin-Anglo-Saxon Vocabulary[5] of Aelfric, Abbot of Eynsham. In this collection the Latin words are placed first with single Anglo-Saxon equivalents following, as *Aratrum,* suhl; *Buris,* suhlbeam; *Stiba,* suhlhandla; *Vitularius,* cealfahus; *Radii,* spacan; *Rota,* hweol. Though the compiler gives only

---

[3]1713, 3rd edition; 1723, 5th ed.; 1745, 10th ed.; 1782, 18th ed.; 1785, 19th ed.; 1797, 21st ed.; 1807, 23rd ed.; 1816, 26th ed. See Kennedy, *Op. cit.* The University of Texas Library has copies of the 13th & 18th editions.

[4]I refer to the title-page of the 1749 edition of the *London Vocabulary,* which I have before me. This statement is not in the British Museum edition of 1700? It was probably in subsequent editions, as it is in the 19th, 1785.

[5]See Thomas Wright's *Anglo-Saxon* and *Old English Vocabularies,* second edition, edited and collated by Richard Paul Wülcker, London, 1884. 2 vols. Vol. I, pp. 106ff.

Alphabetical vocabularies and interlinear glosses are ruled out of this study as not strictly in the tradition I am tracing.

fifteen headings in the text proper, there are in fact thirty topics or groups. The lists begin with the names of agricultural implements or tools and conclude with the names of ships and their parts. Included between are groups of words pertaining to ecclesiastical affairs, to officials in church and state, to Roman law, to man, his kindred, the parts of the body, diseases, the house with its parts and contents, food, drink; the names of beasts, birds, herbs, trees, colors, clothes, games and amusements, weapons; heaven, earth, sun, moon, angel, and archangel.

The general correspondence of topics with their related word groups to those of the *London Vocabulary* is obvious from this summary. There are, in fact, nineteen topic-headings in common in the two vocabularies so widely separated in time. On the other hand, there are some topics in each not found in the other; and there are differences in arrangement and emphasis as to the subjects in common. Words in the Aelfric, for example, pertaining to the twelve winds, to colors, to songs and readings in the church, to games and amusements are missing in the Greenwood; and in the latter text word groups as to fishes, minerals and metals, time, and the four elements have no place in the Latin-Anglo-Saxon. The word-list for agriculture has first place in the Aelfric and nineteenth in the Greenwood, while the list concerned with heaven, angels and archangels, the sun and the moon, in the twenty-fourth position in Aelfric, is first in the 18th century vocabulary. The Abbot devotes relatively larger space than does the London schoolmaster to herbs and plants—probably owing to the interest in them for medicinal purpose—and, also, to drinks, there being thirteen entries under *wine*, not to mention ale, beer, mead, etc.

A Latin-Anglo-Saxon Vocabulary[6] of the eleventh century carries on the tradition, with an interesting modification.

---

[6]Reproduced in the Wright-Wülcker, *ibid.*, pp. 306 ff. The MS, which follows that of Aelfric's Grammar, is printed from a copy in MS Cotton, Julius A II., in the British Museum. See the Wright-Wülcker text, p. 306n.

Though somewhat condensed and without topical headings, this Vocabulary falls roughly into eighteen groups, fifteen of which correspond, in general, to those found in the eighteenth century vocabulary. The topics (supplied by the present writer) of the eleventh century collection run thus: *(1) God, heaven, angels, archangels, sun, moon, earth, sea; *(2) man, woman, the parts of the body; *(3) terms of consanguinity, professional and trades people, artisans; *(4) diseases; (5) abstract terms (*impious, just, prudent,* etc.); (6) times of year, of day, seasons, weather; (7) color; *(8) birds; *(9) fishes; *(10) beasts, *(11) herbs, *(12) trees; *(13) house furnishings; *(14) kitchen and cooking utensils; *(15) weapons; (16) parts of the city; *(17) metals and precious stones; (18) general—both abstract and concrete terms. At this point the compiler of the vocabulary[7] seems to have tired, and he concludes with the statement: "We ne magon swa þeah ealle naman awritan ne furþor geþencan."

Two things about this vocabulary are noteworthy: (1) the correspondence with respect to word groups to those of the tenth century list, discussed above, and to the eighteenth century Greenwood text; (2) The arrangement of groups. In beginning with God and the angels, the planets, the earth and the sea, then proceeding to man in general, to particular types of professional men and artisans and their occupations; to beasts, birds, fishes; then to plants, trees, and houses, the compiler suggests a logic in disposing his topics which is uncommon among the early word collectors. Furthermore, this is the sole example I have found —though there may well be others—before the sixteenth century, in which the group of words pertaining to God, heaven, earth, etc., stands at the head of the list. In the period of the Renaissance, such a beginning becomes the rule rather than the exception.

The next document which shows the persistence of the tradition is a *Semi-Saxon Vocabulary* of the middle of the

[7]The starred topics are those which anticipate groupings of later word-lists, especially *The London Vocabulary.*

twelfth century.[8] Though this vocabulary is fragmentary and without topic-headings, a glance through the list shows that the compiler—probably a teacher, as most of these vocabularies and glosses were gathered and used by teachers—had in mind what we may now term the conventional subjects. He begins with the names of parts of the body and follows with the nomenclature of consanguinity, artisans, craftsmen, diseases, beasts, birds, fish, herbs, trees, houses, furnishings, etc. Incidentally, beginning the vocabulary with the names of parts of the body in Latin and English became the common practice in the fifteenth century.

One other text in the Anglo-Norman period, though not strictly in the tradition we are studying, deserves special mention. This is the "De Utensilibus" by the celebrated scholar Alexander Neckham.[9] Neckham's work is of the interlinear-gloss type. He has in Latin a sort of continuous discourse, beginning oddly enough with the kitchen and its implements, articles of food and their preparation, and so on through the various subjects usual in the formal, simple vocabularies. The point of interest is that he still keeps together the words in their different classes in a continuous discourse. This method is an anticipation, as we shall see, of a practice in the seventeenth century.

There are few, if any, manuscripts of vocabularies or educational treatises between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries. This scarcity is due, according to Thomas Wright,[10] to the neglect into which school teaching had fallen. Whatever the cause of the dearth of matter in the fourteenth, manuscripts of grammatical treatises and of Latin-English vocabularies are common in the fifteenth century.

---

[8]Printed by Wright-Wülcker, *ibid.*, 538 ff.

[9]Cf. Thomas Wright, *A Volume of Vocabularies* (1857).

[10]*A Volume of Vocabularies* (1857), "Preface."

Three of these are printed by Wright in his *Volume of Vocabularies*. The first entitled an *English Vocabulary*,[11] and the second a *Nominale*, may be treated summarily. In both, the Latin headings for all distinct groups of words are very prominent, the word-list for each group is longer than in the earlier vocabularies; both place first the names for the parts of man's body, and proceed, though not in the same order, through the conventional topics of man and his activities, of animals, birds, fishes, insects, herbs, trees, fruits, time, the seasons of the year, etc. But neither of these uses the comprehensive topics of God, the heaven, the earth, or the four elements. They do, however, place before the Latin nouns the proper qualifying adjective, as *hic crinis, haec facies, hoc tempus.*

The third vocabulary in this fifteenth century group is, in one respect, a distinct innovation: this is a pictorial vocabulary. As to topics under which words are assembled, this collection is fairly conventional, beginning with names pertaining to the human body, then continuing with words relating to the church, names of domestic animals and wild animals, of fresh water fish and sea fish—distinctions not generally made in the earlier vocabularies. Then, too, this compiler has more about the baker, the brewer, the butler; about waters, lands, and planets. Though this vocabulary includes the conventional elements, it is somewhat more comprehensive and more careful as to classification. The unique feature is, however, the crude pictures. These sketches occupy the margins and what would have been otherwise blank spaces. Some of the drawings, as those on the second page, seem to have no reference to the text. Others, such as the bell (756), the cock (760), the dragon (765), the flask (772), and the *cloaca* (privy) (800), and the well (800) are definitely illustrative sketches, placed near the words they are designed to illustrate. Incidentally, the *cloaca* is probably the best illustration. This pictorial vocabulary was not printed until the middle of the

[11]Also by R. P. Wülcker in the second edition of Wright's work, in 1884, I, 635–813.

nineteenth century; and I know of no other vocabulary or dictionary in which illustrations appear before the seventeenth century.

The traditional methods and matter in vocabulary building are continued by three English schoolmasters—John Stanbridge, William Horman, and Robert Whittinton. But as their printed texts pertinent to this discussion, fall, with one exception, in the early years of the sixteenth century, we shall defer consideration of their work to that period.

One other book belonging to the last years of the fifteenth century must be mentioned here. The author is Johannes de Sancto Geminiano, and the title of his book is *Summa de Exemplis et Similitudinibus Rerum.* This work was[12] printed at Venice in 1497. The text, in Latin throughout, is hardly to be regarded as a vocabulary or a dictionary. The purpose, as the title suggests, is to present similitudes, similes or comparisons, drawn from a very wide range. In this respect the *Summa* is anticipatory of Erasmus's *Parabolae aut Similia* (1514) or Meres's *Palladis Tamia* (1598). The author employs regularly the "as—so" formula in such a comparison as this: "As the Adamant by little and little draweth the heavy iron, untill at the last it be ioyned with it: so vertue and wisedome ioyne men unto them."[13] But the relevancy of the *Summa* to this study lies in the choice and arrangement of topics. When the author introduces a subject, he illustrates the meaning by the use of the similitude of comparison. More suggestive, however, is the matter and organization. The *Summa* is in ten parts or "Books" with captions which may be translated thus: (1) Of Heaven and the Elements, (2) Of Metals and Stones, (3) Of Vegetables and Plants, (4) Of Swimmers and Fliers [i.e. fish and birds], (5) Of Animals Terrestrial, (6) Of Man

---

[12]The Huntington Library has copies printed at Venice, by J. & G. Gregriis, 10 April, 1497 and Basel, by J. Froben & J. Petri, 25 Jan. 1499. I have consulted the copy of 1497.

[13]The quotation is William Baldwin's translation, 1547, (*Moral Philosophy*) from Erasmus. It illustrates the type of comparison in Geminiano's *Summa.*

and his Members, (7) Of Visions and Dreams, (8) Of Canons and Laws, (9) Of Artists and Craftsmen and the things they make, (10) Of the Actions and Customs of Mankind.[14]

Though here are fewer topics than appear in the word-lists or vocabularies we have noticed, these headings emphasize the same general groups and are more comprehensive. Noteworthy, too, is the first heading concerning the heavens and the four elements, the latter not having entered the early vocabularies. Finally, the all-embracing character of the subject matter here suggests the pansophism of the seventeenth century. But this is to anticipate.

Before proceeding further on our journey, we may briefly take our bearings and see where we are. In the beginning, the analysis of *The London Vocabulary* showed certain large topics about which the author grouped the words which he regarded as fundamental to the young student. These were placed in parallel columns, the English before the Latin, and, within groups given a sort of continuity by means of interlinking phrases or sentences. And each group was illustrated by a composite picture. Our survey, thus far, reveals that the Medieval Latin-English vocabularies collected words under similar topics with variation as to arrangement of headings; that in one instance the initial topic concerned the Creator and the larger creations of the heaven, the earth, and the planets; that another, keeping together the words in their various classes, wove them into a sort of continuous discourse; that one vocabulary illustrated some of its terms by pictures; and, finally, that Geminiano's *Summa* introduced the topic of the four

---

[14]The Latin headings are thus:

Bk. I. De Celo & elementis
II. De Metallis & lapidibus
III. De Vegetabilibus & plantis
IV. De Natatilibus & Volatilibus
V. De Animalibus terrestribus
VI. De homine & Membris suis
VII. De Visionibus & Somnis
VIII. De Canonibus & legibus
IX. De artificibus & rebus artificialibus
X. De actibus & moribus humanis. . .

elements and emphasized the encyclopaedism of such collections. We might stop here, suggesting that the traditional character of *The London Vocabulary* is sufficiently established. But there are, I hope, more significant conclusions to be reached in following the tradition further.

I referred above to the work of John Stanbridge and two of his contemporaries. Stanbridge's published works pertinent to this discussion are the *Vocabula* (1496) and the *Vulgaria* (1508), books designed to assist English boys in the study of Latin. As the principle of presentation is very similar in the two texts, I shall discuss only the earlier. Though the *Vocabula* was first published in 1496, it enjoyed greatest vogue in the sixteenth century, going through six editions between 1510 and 1531.[15] In his choice

[15]Printed by W. de Worde, 1510; by R. Pynson, 1513, 1516, 1519; W. de Worde, 1525, 1531. The *Vulgaria* was printed by de Worde in 1508, 1516, 1518, 1528? See *Short-Title Catalogue*.

of topics Stanbridge is conventional. He begins with parts of the body, treats man, his diseases, his professions and crafts, animals, birds, fish, etc. . . . His method of presentation, however, varies. For the first few pages of his *Vocabula* he has the usual order of arrangement in parallel columns under general topics. Thereafter, though he retains general headings, he presents the words, metrically arranged, across the page—the Latin in large type and the English equivalents *above* in smaller type. The page has thus the appearance of an interlinear translation but without the links, except the association of words and the metrical arrangement, designed to assist the memory.

William Horman's *Vulgaria* (1519), though not strictly in the tradition I am tracing, is relevant to this study, as will appear later. Horman's book has been briefly described as follows:

> The book consists of some three thousand Latin sentences with English translations under them arranged in chapters on such topics as *De Pietate, De Impietate, De Animi Bonis et Malis*, etc., the whole forming a compendium of Tudor knowledge on almost every subject.[16]

[16]Quoted from Beatrice White's edition of the *Vulgaria* of Stanbridge and of Whittinton, *EETS*, Original Series, No. 187 (1932),

This plan of organization obviously derives from the anthologies or flowers of Latin poetry, or the *Polyanthea* of Mirabellius, so popular in the sixteenth century.

Robert Whittinton, a competitor of Horman and Stanbridge, published his *Vulgaria* in 1520. This work effectively combines the method of Horman with certain features of the earlier vocabularies. In illustration of grammatical principles, Whittinton employs sentences—the English above the Latin equivalent—under headings of abstract words such as *piety* and *impiety, virtue,* and *vice,* as in Horman. Whittinton goes further, however, and presents in sentence form the stock subjects of the older vocabularies, such as parts of the body, diseases, terms of consanguinity, etc. Characteristic entries in his *Vulgaria* are these:

Exempla plenitudinis vel inopiae

A foole is so ful of wordes that he dassheth
out all that lyeth on his herte.
Fatuus verbis adeo turgidies est: ut omnia
animi secreta ebulliat vel effutiat.[17]

Exempla de affinitate

My masters fader in lawe wyll be here to daye
Socer heri vel hero affuturus est, vel aderit hodie
This is my broders moder in lawe.
Haec est socrus fratris vel fratri.
She is daughter in lawe to myn uncle.
Illa est genera patrui vel patruo.[18]

The methods evolved by Horman and Whittinton are definitely suggestive of those employed by a more famous teacher in the seventeenth century.

Texts by the schoolmasters I have just discussed had their vogue in the first half of the sixteenth century, the *Vocabula* of Stanbridge, nearer to the traditional vocabularies, being the most popular. In the meantime a book published on the

---

Introd., p. xxv. Horman's *Vulgaria* was reprinted by the Roxburghe Club, 1926. I have not seen a copy.

[17]Cf. B. White, *ibid.*, p. 76.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 55.

Continent in 1549 shows that the medieval tradition in vocabularies and dictionaries persisted elsewhere in Europe, and doubtless helped to perpetuate the practice in England. I refer to a small dictionary in Latin, Flemish, and Gallic compiled by Ioannes Paludanus[19] and published[19a] in Belgium. The title-page, in Latin, states, in substance, that this is a small dictionary of ordinary things for the general use of boys or children. The words and phrases are in the conventional arrangement of parallel columns—Latin, Flemish, French—under the traditional topics. The headings begin (1) Of God and divine things, (2) Of Times, (3) Of the Names of the Twelve Months of the Year, (4) Of the Four elements and the things which are engendered of them, (5) Of Lands, of Waters . . . and continue through forty-three headings, including all the conventional groupings of the early vocabularies, and some subjects, such as books, the seven liberal arts, weights and measures, money, and numbers, not hitherto common.

Two observations on this book are here pertinent: (1) the tendency to all-inclusiveness, as beginning with divine affairs and the four elements and including topics on the larger aspects in the life of man and beast. (2) The incorporation—the first time, to my knowledge—under the title of "dictionary"[20] of topics and word-lists in parallel order which hitherto had appeared in conventional vocabularies and nominales.

In England, a few years after Paludanus's book there appeared a similar text, a *Dictionary for Yonge Beginners,* by John Withals, 1556. This is an English-Latin text similar

---

[19]For information on Paludanus, see the *Biographie Nationale de Belgique.*

[19a]I have consulted the edition of 1549 (in the British Museum), which has these words on the title-page: "Dictionariolum Rerum Maxime Vulgarium, in Communem Puerorum Usum, ex optimis quibusque autoribus congestum, cum Flandrica & Gallica interpretatione . . . Gandani . . . MDXLIX.

[20]The Dictionary of John of Garlande includes many of the groups in the conventional vocabularies, but the method of presentation is similar to that of an interlinear gloss.

in its choice of topics and in the order of presentation, as in its comprehensiveness, to that of the Belgian compiler. To the latter, Withals may well be indebted. His indebtedness to Elyot's Latin-English dictionary is demonstrable, in that he has reversed the order by placing the English before the Latin and borrowed numerous definitions from Elyot. Certain entries, also, derive from Stanbridge's *Vocabula.* And the whole text of Withals is in the tradition we are tracing, the one noteworthy change being that the English is placed before the Latin.[21] Withals also introduces under the various headings many phrases and sentences which have no precedents in the vocabularies, but rather in alphabetical dictionaries. But a glance at the *Dictionarie for Yonge Beginners* reveals at once the conventional character of the topics chosen under which to group the words, and the usual method of the early vocabularies. Here are the sky, the stars, the planets, the seasons, the four elements, with the words pertaining to each; the sea "with all that belongeth to it," including ships and fishes; man, the parts of his body and his diseases; his houses; his occupations and crafts; beasts and birds, trees and herbs, etc. And Withals, more than his predecessors strives for logic in his arrangement of groups.

Beginning with the aether, for example, he presents things celestial, as the sky, the spheres, the starres; he mentions the twelve signs of the zodiac; he continues with the seven planets, the divisions of time, the seasons, the four elements of fire, air, water, and earth and the common words and ideas associated with each. So throughout, the author sought to suggest, by arrangement, a close relationship of words within groups as well as connections between groups themselves. Apparently, Withals shared the belief of his time in a definite cosmic order.

This little *Dictionarie* became at once popular and was reissued at regular intervals until 1634. Through Withals

---

[21]For this order Withals, of course, had a precedent in the *Promptorium Parvulorum*, the earliest English-Latin dictionary.

the tradition carries over[22] through the first third of the seventeenth century.

Other books besides the Withals gave vogue to the conventional word-lists or vocabularies in the second half of the sixteenth century. Most of the bilingual manuals used in teaching modern foreign languages devoted part of their space to such lists. Claudius Hollyband, a teacher of French in London published two manuals—*The French Littleton* (1566)[23] and *The French Schoole Maister* (1573). These little books contained dialogues of daily life in London, proverbs and sentences, the Lord's Prayer, articles of faith, the ten commandments, and a vocabulary—all on parallel pages, the French before the English. The more extensive vocabulary in the *French Schoole Maister* has many topics similar to those in the Withals, from which it probably drew. The conventional lists appear also in Florio's *First Frutes* (1578), in Italian and English; in William Stepney's *The Spanish Schoolmaster* (1591), in Spanish and English.[23a]

John Rider's *Bibliotheca Schoolastica* (1589), an English-Latin dictionary, arranged alphabetically, retained at the end many of the topic headings and the customary vocabulary; and this practice was continued in the Rider-Holyoke dictionaries until the middle of the seventeenth century.

At this point, it is necessary, however, to give some attention to a language manual which appeared early in the seventeenth century. Though this book is but obliquely related to the tradition we are studying, its relevancy to this discussion will become obvious as we proceed. I refer to a school-book by William Bathe (1564–1614), generally

---

[22]Copies I have consulted in the British Museum are dated as follows: 1556, 1568, 1574, 1581, 1586, 1599, 1602, 1608, 1616, 1634.

[23]The name is taken from Littleton's *Tenures*, the popular work on English law.

[23a]*The Nomenclator, or Remembrancer* (London, 1585), in Latin, Greek, French, Spanish, and English, by Adrian Junius, a Dutch physician, is in the vocabulary tradition. The influence of this book is more pronounced, however, on seventeenth-century dictionaries than on vocabularies or other nomenclatures.

referred to by writers on education as Bateus,[24] his Latinized name. Bathe, as the dates show, was an almost exact contemporary of William Shakespeare (1564–1616). Born at Dublin, educated at Oxford, Louvain, and Padua, Bathe became rector of the Irish College at Salamanca (1604–1608). There, with the assistance of Irish Jesuits on the teaching staff, he prepared a Latin-Spanish manual. This work was published at Salamanca in 1611 with the title *Janua Linguarum,*[25] the Gate of Tongues. In 1615, William Welde translated the Spanish into English, added an index or brief dictionary, and had the *Janua* published in London as a Latin-English manual. Two years later, Jean Barbier, retaining the English of Welde, the Latin and Spanish of the original *Janua,* added French, and published the work under the following title:

Ianua Linguarum, Quadrilinguis, or A Messe of Tongues: Latine, English, French, and Spanish Neatly Served up together, for a wholesome repast, to the worthy curiositie of the studious . . . Londini . . . M.DC.XVII.[26]

According to Corcoran, there were nine English[27] editions, about 11,000 copies, of Bathe's *Janua* by 1645. It is, however, not so much the vogue as the content and method of Bathe's *Janua*—which remained unchanged in the various redactions—that interests us.

---

[24]For a detailed account of Bathe and his work, see the Reverend T. Corcoran's *Studies in the History of Classical Teaching,* 1500–1700, published by The Educational Company, Ltd., Dublin and Belfast, 1911. Part I of Corcoran's book treats Bathe and his method of language teaching. In Part III, "Appendices," there is additional biographical information (in Latin) on Bathe.

Cf. also, the sketch of Bathe in the *D.N.B.*

[25]The title-page of a copy of the 1611 edition in the British Museum (B.M. C. 33. f. 7) reads thus: Ianua Linguarum sive Modus Maxime Accomodatus, Quo Patefit Aditus Ad Omnes Linguas Intelligendas . . . Salmantieae Apud Franciscum de Cea Tesa. Anno M.D.C.XI.

[26]A copy of this edition is in the Rare Book Collection, The University of Texas Library.

[27]*Op. cit.,* pp. 87 ff. For the author's exposition of Bathe's method of choosing the vocabulary and the plan of presentation, see pp. 17 ff.

From Latin word-lists, Bathe chose terms according to a three-fold classification: (1) those in daily use, (2) those that are fundamental, (3) those that are unusual. Disregarding this over-lapping classification, we may note that the author, in this manner collected some 5,000 words. This list he then classified into twelve Centuries, and fitted the words into 1200 (actually 1141) statements or sentences.

Each century of sentences is concerned with some generally defined subject: e.g., the first 100 sentences deal with morality under certain broad aspects of vice and virtue; the next 100 bear on prudence and imprudence; the third on temperance and intemperance; the fourth treats of justice and injustice; the fifth of fortitude and weakness.

After the cardinal virtues are treated, there is a different grouping: e.g., in the sixth century, the caption is "human activity"; in the seventh, "peace and strife"; in the eighth, "things with and without life"; in the ninth, a collection dealing with arts and crafts; the tenth, treating various subjects. The final group of sentences (1101–1200) is presented under a different plan. The remaining words, after the construction of sentences in the earlier groups, are introduced into a narrative on jealousy and envy, extending to a hundred numbered clauses.

Apparently, the method thus described was thought of as new in 1611. It is to be noted, however, that the author introduces into his framework certain topics, such as those on "human activity" and on "the arts and crafts," which are recurrent in the vocabularies we have studied. The general plan, that of placing apt sentences under abstract topics of virtue and vice, temperance and intemperance, etc., is fairly definitely anticipated in the *Vulgaria* of Horman and the *Vulgaria* of Whittinton,[28] not to mention the Latin *Polyantheas,* and Elyot's *Bankette of Sapience*— all current from the early sixteenth century. Bathe is, however, more systematic in his assembling of terms to be

[28]See p. 126, above.

defined, more rigorous in adherence to his plan, more insistent on the teaching of morals. Incidentally, the title of his book, is, so far as I know, original, and also felicitous. And this title as well as suggestions from his method were soon to be employed by a more famous educator in the seventeenth century.

My reference is to John Amos Comenius (Komensky, 1592–1671), who rose to be bishop of Moravia and an educational reformer of wide renown. Of Comenius's life and of his ideas on education, except those which have direct bearing in this essay, I cannot here write.[29] But I wish to consider briefly two of his books and their provenance: *Janua Linguarum Reserata* (1631) and *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* (1657). The title of the first was obviously suggested by that of Bathe, discussed above. Comenius is known to have received the Jesuit's book with keen interest, expecting from reports of it to find in it a system of language teaching in consonance with his ideal. Disappointed in this book, he wrote his own text and named it, as if to satirize the title of his predecessor's book, *The Gate of Tongues Unlocked.*[30] This work was first printed at Leszna (1631) in Latin and German, in the same year in England in English, French, and Latin; and in the course of a few

---

[29]On Comenius's life, see S. S. Laurie's *John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians—His Life and Educational Works*, Syracuse, N. Y., 1882; the same author's *Studies in the History of Educational Opinion from the Renaissance;* Will S. Monroe's *Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform*, N.Y., 1900; J. C. Brunet's *Manual du Libraire; Biographie Universelle*, Ancienne et Moderne, Paris, n.d.

[30]The title-page of the second English edition (1633) reads thus: The Gate of Tongues Unlocked and Opened, or else A Seminarie or seed-plot of all Tongues and Sciences. That is, a short way of teaching and thorowly learning within a yeere and a halfe at the farthest, the Latin, English, French, and any other tongue, together with the ground and foundation of Arts and Sciences, comprised under an hundred Titles, and 1058 Periods . . . London . . . 1633.

The University of Texas Library has a copy of the *Janua*, dated 1643, in Latin and English; and also a copy dated, 1662, in Latin, English, and Greek. The plan of presentation is the same in all editions, except the variation as to the number of languages.

years, it was printed with improvements and variations in almost all the European languages. Except for the variation[31] as to languages, the content and method remained the same. The full title of the first edition suggests the scope and method of the *Janua: "The Gate of Languages Unlocked,* or the *Seminary of all Languages and Sciences;* that is a compendious method of learning Latin or any other tongue, along with the elements of all the Sciences and Arts, comprehended under a hundred chapter-headings and a thousand [actually 1058] sentences."[32] These illustrative sentences are arranged in order of difficulty, being simple in the first part of the text and gradually increasing in complexity in the latter part.

After an introduction in which he insists that the reader give attention to things and words, Comenius proceeds; and some of the chapter-headings will convey an idea of the scope of his writings: Concerning the Origin of the World. Concerning the Elements. Concerning the Firmament, Fire, Meteors, Waters, Earths, Stones, Metals, Trees, and Fruits, Herbs, Shrubs. These things are treated of in thirteen chapters, and 141 sentences. Then we have "Concerning Animals," which, under different subdivisions, occupies the book to the nineteenth chapter, inclusive. Then, Concerning Man: his Body; External Members; Internal Members; the qualities or accidents of the Body; Diseases; Ulcers and Wounds; the External Senses; the Internal Senses; Mind; the Will and the Affections; these occupy the book to the twenty-ninth chapter, inclusive. All the mechanic arts now follow, and are concluded in the forty-eighth chapter and 539th sentence. The rest of the

---

[31]Editions appeared in England in 1631, 1633, 1637, 1639, 1643, 1662, 1670, etc. At Danzig, in 1634, the *Janua* was printed in Latin, German, and Polish; at Stockholm, in 1640, in Latin, German, Swedish; at Amsterdam, in 1661, in Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, and German; at Amsterdam, 1662, in Latin, French, and Dutch, etc., not to metion all. Cf. Brunet, *Manuel.*

[32]In the description of the text I follow Professor Laurie. I have not examined the first edition. The editions of 1639, 1643, and 1662, which I have examined, are substantially the same as to plan and content.

book treats of the House and its parts: Marriage and the Family; Civic and State Economy; Grammar, Dialectic, Rhetoric, Arithmetic, Geometry, and all branches of knowledge; Ethics, and twelve chapters are assigned to the twelve virtues. Games, Death, Burial, the Providence of God and Angels, form the concluding chapters. This, as Professor Laurie remarks, is encyclopaedism. And those who have followed this discussion may now begin to see the *Janua* in perspective.

But before we attempt to venture conclusions concerning this book, we must notice briefly the *Orbis Pictus* (1657), which though intended to be supplementary and subsidiary to the *Janua* is in fact a fuller application of Comenius's principles than any other text. These principles are stated by the author in his Preface to the reader. He writes:

> The foundation of all learning consists in representing clearly to the senses sensible objects, so that they can be apprehended easily. I maintain that this is the basis of all other actions, inasmuch as we could neither act nor speak wisely unless we comprehended clearly what we wished to say or do. For it is certain that there is nothing in the Understanding which has not been previously in the Senses; and consequently, to exercise the senses carefully in discriminating the differences of natural objects is to lay the foundations of all wisdom, all eloquence, and all good and prudent action.

Here are the ideas of realism in education—of learning from Nature through the senses, of the close association of words and things, of the parallel pursuit of these, and by the process, to reach universal wisdom—pansophy. In the light of this Preface the words of the title-page become more intelligible: *Orbis Sensualium Pictus,* etc.,[33] "The World of Sensible Things drawn; that is, the Nomenclature of all Fundamental Things in the World and Actions in Life reduced to Ocular Demonstration." The

---

[33]The full Latin title is *Orbis Sensualium Pictus:* Hoc est Omnium Principalium in Mundo Rerum, & in vita Actionum, Pictura & Nomenclatura. See the reprint by Bardeen, Syracuse, N.Y., 1887, p. x. All page references to the *Orbis* are to this reprint unless otherwise noted.

text consists of 151 chapters, ranging from the Creation to the Last Judgment, including all the topics hitherto mentioned in the vocabularies and dictionaries. Each chapter is illustrated with a composite cut or engraving, each item in which is numbered. The sentences under the chapter-heading bear directly upon the illustration, each sentence having an italicised and numbered word corresponding to a numbered item in the drawing. The author thus makes clear the association of the word with the thing of which is it a symbol. For example, under the caption "The Study" (p. 120) we have the picture of a small room with a shelf of books at one end, and in the foreground a student seated at a table poring over a book—the room, the book, the desk having numbers corresponding to the numbers in the lesson—thus: "The *Study,* 1. is a place where a Student, 2, apart from Men, sitteth alone, addicted to his *Studies,* whilst he readeth *Books,* 3."

These illustrations with their heightened appeal to the senses constitute the fundamental difference between the *Orbis* and the *Janua.* Another difference is that the sentences in the *Orbis* are not numbered; numbers are there employed for words which refer to the pictures and for parts of the pictures themselves. There is considerable correspondence as to topics in the two texts, but the range of the *Orbis* is the greater. It has 151 chapters as against 100 for the *Janua.*

Content of the Orbis[34]

After an introductory chapter in which the master invites the boy to come and learn wisdom, the chapter topics run thus: God, the world, the heavens, fire, the air, the water, the clouds, the earth, stones, metals, trees, herbs, fruits (2–18); animals—birds, fishes, four-footed beasts, etc. (19–35); Man, ages of man, parts of the body, outward and inward senses (36–44); handicrafts—plowing, grinding, baking, brewing, weaving, carpentry, etc. (45–61); the house, its parts and furnishings (62–80); ships, travel, writing, printing, books, bookshops, school, study, stage-plays (81–101); philosophy, geometry, astronomy (102–108); moral philosophy and

[34]For comparison with the *Janua,* see pp. 129–132, above.

the cardinal virtues (109–117); marriage, the family, terms of consanguinity (118–128); games, warfare, religion, burial, God's providence, the last judgment (129–150); final advice of master to boy and farewell (151).

Inadequate as these descriptions are of the *Janua* and the *Orbis,* they suffice to convey a general conception of the matter and the method. We are now prepared to ask to what extent are the materials and the plan of presentation traditional; or to what degree do they represent that which is novel in thought and in the method of teaching languages? Recalling the descriptions and summaries in this survey, we see that the principle of compiling vocabularies under a series of certain well-defined topics had been active from the early Middle Ages; that in the Renaissance the range of such topics was wide enough to afford inclusiveness, as exemplified in the small dictionaries of Paludanus and of John Withals, not to mention all. Again, in the early sixteenth century the method of including in sentences the words for study and placing the sentences in parallel columns under conventional topics or headings, was, as in the *Vulgaria* of Horman, occasionally used; and in the early seventeenth century more systematically employed by William Bathe. Finally, we recall that there was at least one example of a pictorial or illustrated vocabulary. In brief, there were current before Comenius all the elements that are found in his *Janua* and his *Orbis*— the tested topics under which words were grouped, the wide range, implying universality, the use of sentences to give coherence to word-lists, the arrangement in parallel columns, with the vernacular first. But no other book, so far as I know, exhibited the particular combination of these elements that is found in the manuals of the Moravian bishop and educator.

To the scrutiny of traditional materials and methods, Comenius brought a vital interest and a seasoned judgment determined by wide reading and by teaching experience. His inspiration came partly from the German teacher

Ratich, partly from the writings of Francis Bacon,[35] who, as Comenius said, "has given us the true key of nature." This view posits following the course of Nature, the use of the senses in the acquisition of facts, the inductive process by which to arrive at valid conclusions, and the possibility of universal knowledge. Such a view, together with a suggestion from Lubinus of Rostock as to the illustrations for the *Orbis,* resulted in a recombination of conventional materials and methods, and the consummation of a tradition.

There is, however, one more short lap in our journey. In 1675, John Ray (1629–1705), the naturalist, published his *Dictionariolum Trilinguis,* a little dictionary in English, Latin, and Greek. This book was reissued at intervals[36] through the first quarter of the eighteenth century. It contains thirty-three chapters without illustrations—but with the conventional headings: "Of Heaven," "Of the Elements," being supposedly more accurate than most nomenclators in recording the names of plants and animals.

To change the figure, the wheel has now come full circle. We are back to James Greenwood and *The London Vocabulary.* I stated earlier that though this book was part of a tradition, the immediate sources were in writings of the seventeenth century. According to the *DNB, The London Vocabulary* is nothing more than an abridgment of the *Orbis Pictus*—a statement which is not true. Professor Laurie's assertion that Greenwood's book is an imitation of the *Orbis* is more nearly correct. In reality, Greenwood had two sources. For the topics or chapter headings and the vocabulary he drew largely from Ray's dictionary or Nomenclator.[37] For the pictorial illustrations, the methods of reference to them, the use of phrases and sentences for

---

[35]Cf. Laurie, *Studies in the History of Educational Opinion from the Renaissance,* p. 149.

[36]According to the *DNB,* editions appeared in 1675, 1685, 1689, 1706 (5th edition), 1717, 1726; 1735 (8th ed., Dublin).

[37]Ray has 33 chapters; Greenwood 34. Compare the two works in the chapters on "Fire," for example, and various other topics. Greenwood rearranges.

links, Greenwood imitated the method of the *Orbis*, and in a few cases seems to have copied some of the pictures.

In conclusion we may observe that, as early as 1868, Thomas Wright suggested the value of these vocabularies, with their topical grouping, as illustrative of the conditions and manners of society and as a body of matter of special worth to the philologists. Wright was thinking, however, of vocabularies made before 1500. My survey shows that similar lists continued to be made for another 150 years, and suggests that systematic study of them may be of even greater value. This survey, furthermore, supplies the historical background essential to the evaluation of the Comenius text books and methods, not, so far as I know, hitherto supplied by writers on education. Finally, it is worth remarking that certain features such as the illustrations of the Comenius and the Greenwood, carry over to modern dictionaries; and there is some wonder that a tradition of so long standing did not exercise a greater influence on English lexicography.

ACOSTA'S *HISTORIA NATURAL Y MORAL DE LAS INDIAS:* A GUIDE TO THE SOURCE AND THE GROWTH OF THE AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC TRADITION

BY THEODORE HORNBERGER

By the rights of discovery and of conquest, the New World belonged in the sixteenth century to the Spaniards. They were the first to report upon the geography of the new-found western lands; their voyagers were the first to describe the strange inhabitants, animals, and plants of the Americas, and to point out in glowing terms the economic possibilities across the Atlantic. So swiftly did the Spaniards take advantage of their opportunities, intellectual as well as economic, that only thirty-four years after the first voyage of Columbus there appeared a systematic treatise on the natural history of the new world: *De la Natural Hystoria de las Indias* (Toledo, 1526), by Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo y Valdés. By the end of the century Spanish knowledge of America had been brilliantly summarized by José de Acosta, sometimes known as the American Pliny. Although Acosta's *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias* (Seville, 1590) has been recognized as the most useful and the most learned of the early commentaries, one cannot say that its truly central place in American cultural history has been widely appreciated.[1] The purpose of the present article is to suggest its unique value as a point of reference, not only for students of Latin-American science but also for those concerned with the history of ideas in English-speaking North America.

[1]The most reliable account is José R. Carracido, *El P. José de Acosta y Su Importancia en la Literatura Científica Española* (Madrid, 1899). See also Clements R. Markham's introduction to the reprint of Edward Grimston's translation (London, 1604), of Acosta's *Historia Natural,* Hakluyt Society Publications, Nos. LX–LXI (London, 1880), and George Brown Goode, "Beginnings of Natural History in America," *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution, 1897,* Pt. II (Washington, 1901), 365.

Quite possibly, Acosta's book reveals, more clearly than any other single work, two important facts: (1) that the intellectual conquest of the New World owed more to the ancients than is generally suspected, and (2) that new hypotheses developed along lines determined by certain puzzling questions which grew out of men's actual experience in America.

Most of the meagre outline of Acosta's life is derived from his own books. He was born in 1540 at Medina del Campo, between Valladolid and Salamanca in northwestern Spain. At the age of thirteen he joined the Society of Jesus, and was presumably educated in one of the colleges of that order. His work leaves no question of his profound learning, much of it doubtless acquired before 1570, when he left Spain to go to the Jesuit college at Juli, near the western shore of Lake Titicaca, in what is now southern Peru. In the course of his long voyage he discovered that books, even the profound ones of the immortal Aristotle, are not always to be trusted. Having read, he says,

> what Poets and Philosophers write of the burning Zone, I perswaded my selfe, that comming to the Equinoctiall, I should not indure the violent heate, but it fell out otherwise; for when I passed, which was when the sun was there for Zenith, being entered into Aries, in the moneth of March, I felt so great cold, as I was forced to go into the sunne to warme me; what could I else do then, but laugh at Aristotle's Meteors and his Philosophie, seeing that in the place and at that season, whenas all should be scorched with heat, according to his rules, I, and all my companions were a colde?[2]

Acosta was in Peru for about fifteen years, first in Juli and then in Lima. Besides taking an active part in the Jesuit work and in the third Council of Lima, he found time to write a number of books, which he took with him in manuscript when he returned to Spain in 1587. In the course of that homeward journey he stopped for a good part of 1586 in Mexico, where he continued to amass information on the natural history and civilization of the

---

[2] *Natural and Moral History*, ed Markham, I, 90. This ed. is cited hereinafter as *History*.

new colonies, the activity which had shared his attention with theology in Peru. Back in Spain, he quickly published the result of his labors, those of a scientific nature appearing at Salamanca in 1588, as *De Natura Novi Orbis Libri Duo.* Two years later, at Seville, there was published a translation of the two books of the *De Natura,* together with five additional books, under the title of *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias.* Before his death in 1600 at Salamanca, where he was head of the Jesuit college, he had published, in addition, six theological treatises.

The *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias* is divided into seven sections, the first four of which deal with natural history. Of these, as has been said, the two first appeared originally in Latin. In its complete form, Acosta's book became enormously popular. There were later Spanish editions in 1591, 1608, 1610, and 1792; an Italian translation appeared in 1596; a French translation of 1597 was reprinted in 1600, 1606, and 1616; a Dutch translation came out in 1598 and 1624; a German translation appeared in 1601; a Latin translation was printed at Frankfort in 1602 and 1603; Edward Grimston's English translation was issued in 1604. Portions of the work also appeared in compilations and collections of voyages, in Latin, German, Dutch, and English, the most important of these being *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (London, 1625), which reprints practically all of Acosta's third and fourth books. Purchas explains, anent the first and second books, that he had already "handled the same" in *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (London, 1613), Bk. VIII, chaps. 1 and 2. The curious reader will discover that Acosta was Purchas's chief authority for the information on New Spain. Clearly enough, Acosta had a considerable part in shaping European ideas of the New World, at the very moment when the English were about to make their belated entrance on the stage of American affairs.

In his advertisement to the reader, Acosta states exactly what, in the way of scientific information, he has in his mind to convey. Other writers, he says, have written of the new and strange things in the New World at the West

Indies, but "hitherto I have not seene any other Author which treates of the causes and reasons of these novelties and wonders of nature, or that hath made any search thereof." In fact, he continues, such search is difficult,

> being the works of Nature, contrarie to the antient and received Philosophy, as to shew that the region which they call the burning Zone is very moist, and in many places very temperate, and that it raines there, whenas the Sunne is neerest, with such like things. For such as have written of the West Indies have not made profession of so deepe Philosophie; yea, the greatest part of those Writers have had no knowledge thereof.[3]

His intent, in other words, is to correct those parts of natural philosophy (that is, science in general) which the New World, by its very existence, had demonstrated to be most obviously in error.

From Acosta's citations it is possible to know with fair accuracy what he meant by "the ancient and received Philosophy," what writers he had read, and which of them he most respected. This evidence has the added interest of suggesting what kind of library the Jesuits may have taken with them to such a remote corner of the sixteenth-century world as Peru. For it was in Peru that Acosta wrote the first two sections of his book, which deal in the main, despite some reference to astronomical theories, with what is now called physical geography, that is, with the external features and changes of the earth. To read these sections is to review the geographical literature of antiquity.[4] Acosta knew that most persistent of geographical fables—Plato's description in the *Timaeus* of the great lost continent of Atlantis—a powerful factor in determining European preconceptions of the New World.[5] He knew

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. xxiv.

[4] See, for convenient summaries, R. E. Dickinson and O. J. R. Howarth, *The Making of Geography* (Oxford, 1933), and John Kirtland Wright, *The Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades*, (American Geographical Society Research Series, XV, New York, 1925).

[5] See William J. Tillinghast, "The Geographical Knowledge of the Ancients Considered in Relation to the Discovery of America,"

the works of Aristotle, in particular the *De Caelo* and the *Meteorologica* (of whose authenticity scholars have considerable doubt), books which for centuries were fundamental to the cosmography of the educated man. He mentions the writings of Agartharchides of Cnidus and Eudoxus of Cyzicus, from the Alexandrian period, although he does not appear to have known Erathosthenes' work in mathematical geography. He was thoroughly acquainted with the *Historia Naturalis* of the elder Pliny, and he had at least heard of Strabo, Pomponius Mela, and Macrobius, the most famous of the Roman geographers. Ptolemy, curiously, is mentioned only once, as the "most excellent Astrologer and Cosmographer." In addition, Acosta refers to geographical or otherwise pertinent notions in the writings of Parmenides, Theophrastus, Dioscorides, Lucretius, Plutarch, Lucan, Virgil, Ovid, Seneca the Younger, and Boethius. Finally, as became a Jesuit, he was well read in the church fathers, especially those of the second, third, and fourth centuries, a period which well deserved, geographically speaking, its recent description as "The Dark Age of Early Christian Teaching."[6] Of the many theologians whom he names, the most important to him were Lactantius, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine; a fuller list would give the names of Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, Theodoret, Theophilus, Paulus Orosius, Procopius of Gaza, and, as Acosta's sole contemporary to have the honor of citation, Arias Montano, a Spanish Biblical commentator. The opinions of these writers tended, by and large, to narrow the bounds of the known world, to deny the sphericity of the earth, and to ignore the evidence of Ptolemy's time that the equatorial zones were inhabited.[7]

Be it said to Acosta's credit that he had scant respect for these authorities, whether pagan or Christian. Of them all,

---

Narrative and Critical History of America, ed. Justin Winsor, I (Boston, 1889), 15–21.

[6]Dickinson and Howarth, *op. cit.*, pp. 39–48.

[7]See Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–76.

Aristotle is least scorned, but even Aristotle could be, and frequently was, completely wrong. Pliny was useful, but there were many facts of which he was ignorant, as Acosta takes pleasure in showing. Among the church fathers St. Augustine commanded the most admiration, Lactantius the most ridicule.

In Book I Acosta deals with five questions of physical geography which had already, by 1590, led to marked disagreement among the learned: (1) What is the shape of the heavens and the earth? (2) Do the antipodes actually exist? (3) Are the torrid zones inhabitable? (4) Did the ancients have any knowledge of the New World? (5) How was the New World populated with men and beasts? No better illustration can be found of the way in which actualities forced men in Acosta's age to devise better working hypotheses than their traditional learning supplied.

With Aristotle, Acosta holds that both the heaven and the earth are round. Against this opinion, and in support of the alternative that the earth is flat and the heaven like a roof over it, were Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophilus, Lactantius, Procopius, Jerome, and even Augustine. Acosta does not wish to belittle the church fathers, who may perhaps have "well imployed their studies in causes of greater waight," but he concludes that

> there is no doubt but the opinion which Aristotle and the other Peripateticks held with the Stoicks (that the figure of Heaven was round, and did moove circularly in his course), is so perfectly true, as we which doe now live in Peru see it visibly. Wherin experience should be of more force then all Philosophicall demonstrations, being sufficient to proove that the Heaven is round, and comprehends and contaynes the earth within it of al parts.[8]

Nevertheless, Acosta marshals his arguments carefully: Heaven is round because it is the most perfect body, demanding the most perfect figure; in Peru, moreover, dark spots in the Milky Way can be seen circling continually about the earth, always relatively in the same position to certain fixed stars, "alwaies of one forme and bignes, as

[8] *History*, I, 4.

we haue noted by infallible observation." That the earth is round is proved by Magellan's circumnavigation of it, by the evidence of the shadow made in an eclipse of the moon, "which could not chance if the earth were not in the midst of the world, compassed in and invironed by the whole Heaven," and by the testimony of Scripture itself (as Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Basil, and Ambrose are forced to admit). We must conclude, says Acosta, "that in the holy scriptures we ought not to follow the letter which killes, but the spirit which quickneth, as saith S. Paul."[9] Yet Acosta, as Andrew Dickson White long ago pointed out, was still among the conservatives, since he left the earth in the midst of a round and finite universe, failing even to mention the Copernican astronomy.[10]

Acosta is likewise on the side of experience as against authority in his remarks upon the distribution of land and sea; one could not well live in Peru and deny that in the antipodes, although the greater part be sea, "there is likewise land, so as in all parts of the world, the earth and water imbrace one another, which truely is a thing to make vs admire and glorifie the Arte of the soveraigne Creator."[11] Yet the belief that the known world was surrounded by an encircling ocean had been held by Aristotle and most other ancient philosophers, the great exceptions being Crates of Mallos and Ptolemy, whom Acosta does not mention.[12] Moreover, as Acosta shows, the existence of land and inhabitants in the antipodes had been scornfully dismissed by the church fathers: by Lactantius, because it seemed ridiculous to him that men should walk with their feet above their heads, and trees and corn grow downwards; and by Augustine, because he believed the great ocean impassable by the

---

[9]See 2 Corinthians, iii. 6.

[10]See *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (New York, 1896), I, 125, and, for a full view of the state of astronomical thought at the time Acosta wrote, Francis R. Johnson, *Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England* (Baltimore, 1937).

[11]*History*, I, 16.

[12]Cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 18–19, 55–57.

sons of Adam. A further argument against the inhabitableness of the antipodes was Aristotle's theory of the zones, according to which only the two temperate regions were judged capable of sustaining life. But "although he were a great Philosopher," Aristotle was deceived on this matter, as were Pliny, Virgil, and Ovid. Their reasons, Acosta admits, were good, and would seem so still "if visible experience did not vnfold this doubt."

In his discussion of the fourth question, Acosta's patriotism comes to the fore; he is disturbed that "some at this day, seeking to obscure the felicitie of this age and the Glory of our Nation, strive to proove that the new-found world was knowne to the Ancients."[13] He is at pains, therefore, to discount the stories of extraordinary voyages in Pliny, the allusions in Seneca's *Medea,* the "great Atlanticke Iland" of Plato, and the suggestions of Arias Montano and Josephus that the Biblical Ophir and Tharsis (or Tarshish) are references to Peru.[14] Nor can he accept the twentieth verse of Obadiah[15] as a prophecy "that this new worlde should be converted to Iesus Christ by the Spanish nation." He is, in fact, constrained to doubt

> that the Ancients had knowledge in the Art of Navigation, whereby men at this day passe the Ocean, . . . I find not that in ancient bookes there is any mention made of the vse of the Iman or Loadstone, nor of the Compasse to saile by; yea, I beleeve they had no knowledge thereof.[16]

How, then, did men and animals come to the New World? On this problem Acosta's authorities afford no theories; he will write, therefore, "what I have conceived, and what comes presently into my minde, seeing that testimonies faile

---

[13]*History,* I, 32.

[14]Cf. accounts of Ophir and Tarshish in any good concordance or Biblical encyclopaedia. The location of both places is a matter of long-standing dispute.

[15]And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess that of the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south.

[16]*History,* I, 47–48.

mee whom I might follow, suffering myselfe to be guided by the rule of reason, although it be very subtill."[17] Men must have come to Peru either by sea or by land. If they came by sea, it must have been by accident, since they lacked the modern aids to navigation, in particular the compass needle magnetized by the loadstone. Acosta is well-informed about the compass, even to the extent of knowing about magnetic variation. Yet, admitting that men may have come by accident, there remains the puzzle of how wild beasts got to the Indies, after the Deluge had destroyed all except those in Noah's ark. Acosta's conclusion, after considering the possibilities of their swimming or flying hither, is

> that the new world, which we call Indies, is not altogether severed and disioyned from the other world; . . . no man knowes how farre the land runnes beyond the Cape of Mendozino in the South sea, . . . no man knowes the lands on the other part of the Straight of Magellan.[18]

Plato's island of Atlantis, however, "cannot be held for true but among children and old folkes," and hence is not acceptable as the explanation of how the New World became populated. The glory of Spain, evidently, meant much to Acosta.

The prominent place of Acosta's questions in the minds of the first Americans may be gauged by recalling briefly a few of the relevant comments in the literature of the Anglo-American colonists. Captain John Smith, for instance, dragged out of a quagmire near Jamestown by the Indians, presented Powhatan, their chief,

> with a compasse diall, describing by my best meanses the vse thereof: whereat he so amazedly admired, as he suffered me to proceed in a discourse of the roundnes of the earth, the course of the sunne, moone, starres, and plannets.[19]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 45–46.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[19] *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, ed. Edward Arber and A. G. Bradley (Edinburgh, 1910), p. 15.

Increase Mather, in 1709, wrote condescendingly that

> It is certain that the *American Hemisphere* was unknown to the Ancients a long Time after the Apostles Days: Nay, the Notion of the *Antipodes* was as incredible to them as the *Earth's Motion* is to some in these Days. I remember one of them derides that Opinion; he says, they are idle men who think there are Inhabitants in the opposite Part of the Earth, for then (says he) they must walk with their Feet superior to their Heads, and Trees would grow downwards, . . . and the Rain fall upwards. And *Austin* calls it a Fable, and says, it is *nulla ratione credendum*, that it is in no wise to be believed that there are Men on the other Side of the Earth, walking with their Feet against ours.[20]

Even more frequently encountered are English speculations upon the origin and descent of the aborigines. Representative opinions are those of John Eliot, who wrote in 1647 that "his reasons are most probable who thinke they are *Tartars* passing out of *Asia* into *America* by the straits of *Anian*,"[21] and of James Adair, whose *History of the American Indians* (London, 1775) was designed to "explode that weak opinion, of the American Aborigines being lineally descended from the Tartars, or ancient Scythians."[22] Adair's elaborate argument was devoted to proving the descent of the Indians from the Lost Tribes of Israel, a theory which antedated Acosta himself.[23] Volumes could be written on all of these matters; the point here is simply that Acosta draws together in his first book a number of the most characteristic perplexities and attitudes of the entire colonial era.

Book II consists of discussion of why the equatorial zone is not only habitable, to the confounding of Aristotle and Pliny, but also sometimes actually more comfortable than the regions just outside the tropics. Acosta finds this problem so fascinating that he is moved "to search out the

---

[20] *A Dissertation Concerning the Future Conversion of the Jewish Nation* (London, 1709), p. 32.

[21] *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d Series, IV (Cambridge, Mass., 1834), 14.

[22] *Adair's History of the American Indians*, ed. Samuel Cole Williams (Johnson City, Tenn., 1930), p. 14.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. xxix–xxx.

causes, not moved therevnto so much by the doctrine of ancient Philosophers, as by reason and certaine experience." There are difficulties, of course, in accounting by a single rule for all the diversities of climate under the line: what is true of Peru is not true of Ethiopia; what is true of some parts of Peru is not true of others. In general, however, the first thing to remember is Aristotle's error in thinking that where the sun is nearest the earth the climate will necessarily be most hot and dry. On the contrary, it is when the sun is most directly overhead that Peru has most rain and humidity. The reason, Acosta thinks, is that the sun draws from the ocean a great abundance of vapors, which dissolve into rain, usually in the afternoon. In the other zones there is, on the other hand, most moisture when the sun is farthest away, which is paradoxical until one considers that

> A thousand effects in naturall causes proceede of contrarie things by divers meanes: we drie linnen by the fire and in the aire, and yet the one heats and the other cooles; . . . in candles of tallow or waxe: if the wike bee great, it melts the tallow or the waxe, for that the heat cannot consume the moistnes which riseth; but if the flame be proporcionable, the waxe melts nor droppes not, for that the flame doth waste it by little and little as it riseth. The which seemeth to me the true reason, why vnder the Equinoctiall and burning Zone, the violence of the heat doth cause raine, the which in other Regions growes through want thereof.[24]

Other things contribute to the comfort of living in Peru: the longer nights, the nearness of the ocean, the highness of the land, and, most important of all, the freshness of the winds which commonly come up in the afternoon. Each of these Acosta treats briefly, but he leaves the particular "discourse of windes, waters, landes, mettalls, plants, and beasts (whereof there is great aboundance at the Indies)" to Books III and IV. In passing, it is worth noting that Queen Elizabeth is said to have charged Sir Walter Raleigh with atheism because he ridiculed Aristotle's notions concerning the torrid zone.[25] Of the signifi-

---

[24] *History*, I, 86–88.

[25] See Goode, *op. cit.*, pp. 359–360.

cance of Acosta's great interest in climate, more will be said presently.

Acosta's scheme in Books III and IV is roughly Aristotelian or Scholastic, although he does not attempt to write of natural history in full. Book III treats of the simple bodies, or elements: air, water, earth, and fire—the subject of such Aristotelian writings as the *De Mundo,* the *De Generatione et Corruptione,* and the *Meterologica.* Book IV deals with the mixed bodies, both inanimate and animate: metals, plants, and beasts. These divisions are among the most ancient in natural philosophy, going back, in the case of the four elements, at least as far as Empedocles, who lived in the fifth century B.C.[26] The Scholastic order of procedure was so natural to educated men everywhere that Francis Higginson organized his *New-Englands Plantation* (London, 1630) by chapters on the earth, the waters, the air, and the fire of that region,[27] while as late as the beginning of the eighteenth century students at Harvard College were perusing Charles Morton's *Compendium Physicae,* which outlined the science of natural bodies as follows:

- Simples as Elements, of which other bodyes are made.
- Mixt
  - Imperfectly; as, Meteors.
  - Perfectly
    - Inanimate; as, Stones, Metals, Minerals.
    - Animate
      - Insensible; as, Plant.
      - Sensible; as animal
        - Irrational: Brute.
        - Rational: Man.[28]

[26]See George Sarton, *An Introduction to the History of Science,* I (Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication No. 376; Washington, 1927), 87.

[27]See facsimile reproduction of the second edition (New York, 1930), sig. B^1, for Higginson's explanation.

[28]MS of Morton, *Compendium Physicae,* transcribed by Daniel Greenleaf (1697), now in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Cf. Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 236–249.

Other instances of the survival of Scholastic methods might be cited, but these suffice to illustrate how Acosta's approach typifies that of the more learned members of many generations of Americans. One might learn a good deal from a thoroughgoing investigation of the extent to which the logical techniques of ancient science hampered effective observation of American phenomena.

By far the largest portion of Acosta's third book deals with the air, or winds. A deep dissatisfaction with Aristotle's explanations is again apparent, as Acosta notes the great diversities in the winds, and concludes that

> it is needefull to seeke further to knowe the true and originall cause of these so strange differences which we see in the windes. I cannot conceive any other, but that the same efficient cause which bringeth foorth and maketh the winds to grow dooth withall give them this originall qualitie, for in trueth the matter whereon the windes are made, which is no other thing (according to Aristotle) but the exhalation of the interior Elements, may well cause in effect a great parte of this diversitie, being more grosse, more subtile, more drie, and more moist. But yet this is no pertinent reason, seeing that we see in one region, where the vapours and exhalations are of one sorte and qualitie, that there rise windes and effects quite contrary. We must therefore referre the cause to the higher and celestiall efficient, which must be the Sunne, and to the motion and influence of the heavens, the which by their contrary motions give and cause divers influences.[29]

Thus Acosta takes up, with marked intelligence, the problem of the trade winds, or Brizes (as they were called in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries). He recognizes their importance to navigation, since they make possible an easy voyage from east to west, and he describes them meticulously. Unfortunately, although he approximates the true explanation of their cause, he falls short of stating it because of his ignorance or rejection of the Copernican demonstration of the motion of the earth. "The earth," he insists, "is not moved," nor is the element of water, "for that it is vnited to the earth and makes one sphere, so as the earth keeps it from all circular motion."

---

[29]*History*, I, 108–109.

The elements of fire and air, being nearer the heavenly regions, are, according to Aristotle's hypothesis in the *Meteorologica,* drawn round in a circular motion by the Primum Mobile, as are the sun, moon, and stars. To support this remarkably archaic argument, Acosta tells of having observed the comet of 1577 moving daily from east to west, "whereby it appeeres that the sphere of the aire being its Region, the element it selfe must of necessitie moove after the same sort."[30]

The relatively large amount of space devoted by Acosta to meteorology and climatology has a significance which is not wholly obvious. From the first, colonial Americans appear to have been keenly interested in the weather, in part, no doubt, because of economic reasons and an understandable curiosity. Some of them, John Cotton, for instance, were as thoroughly grounded in Aristotle as Acosta himself, and tended therefore to write of exhalations and the drawing power of the sun.[31] A goodly number, including Thomas Robie, William Douglass, John Lining, and Professor Winthrop of Harvard, followed Edmund Halley and other members of the Royal Society of London in the collection, by the use of barometer and thermometer, of statistical data.[32] What is surprising, however, is that at least three Anglo-Americans, John Mitchell, John Bartram, and Benjamin Franklin, were carried by their weather interest into bold and sweeping hypotheses, of considerable importance to the history of science. Mitchell explained the fact that it was colder in North America than in Europe by ten or fifteen degrees of latitude on the basis of the greater land masses to the north in the former continent.[33] Bartram suggested shrewdly that the ranges of

---

[30]*Ibid.,* p. 122.

[31]See a discussion of this point by the writer, in the *New England Quarterly,* X, 504–507 (September, 1937).

[32]See A. Wolf, *A History of Science, Technology, and Philosophy in the 16th & 17th Centuries* (New York, 1935), pp. 312–320, and the articles on the men mentioned in the *Dictionary of American Biography.*

[33]*The Present State of Great Britain and North America* (London, 1767), pp. 257–260.

mountains along the eastern seaboard might have some effect upon air currents and rainfall.[34] Franklin, as is more widely known, after discovering by accident that what seemed northeast storms in Philadelphia actually came from the southwest, developed the earliest theory of cyclonic winds.[35] In the light of these facts, Acosta would seem to have had a sure instinct for what his successors would find perplexing.

The greater part of Acosta's discussion of the element of water is actually descriptive geography. He indicates the position of the North and South Seas (the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans), of the Strait of Magellan, of the supposed Northwest Passage, of lakes in Peru and Mexico, of unusual springs and fountains, and of the Amazon and Plata Rivers. There are inserted chapters on tides and on Indian methods of fishing. These pages reveal a fairly good grasp of the geographical knowledge of his day, when the western world had absorbed the information derived from Magellan's voyage.[36] Somewhat surprisingly, Acosta is opposed to the proposal of a canal across the isthmus of Panama; he doubts, in the first place, if human power could "beat and breake downe those strong and impenetrable mountains," and, in the second place, "although it were possible to man, yet in my opinion they should feare punishment from heaven in seeking to correct the workes which the Creator by his great providence hath ordained and disposed in the framing of this vniversall world."[37] Scorn for the errors of Aristotle did not necessarily mean imprudence in flying in the face of Providence.

Acosta's discussion of the element of earth is largely a description of the topography of Peru and Mexico, with comments on the economic possibilities of the various

---

[34]See William Darlington, *Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall* (Philadelphia, 1849), pp. 390–392.

[35]See Carl Van Doren, *Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 1938), pp. 174–175.

[36]See J. N. L. Baker, *A History of Geographical Discovery and Exploration* (Boston, 1931), pp. 85–114.

[37]*History*, I, 136.

regions. Like almost all Americans of the colonial era, he is keenly conscious of how much of the New World remains unexplored and anxious to estimate the extent of the continents.[38] Relevant to the element of fire, he sees "no special matter at the Indies which is not in other regions." Volcanoes he explains as "places that have the propertie to draw vnto them hote exhalations, and to convert them into fire and smoke which, by their force and violence, cast out other thicke matter which dissolves into ashes, into pumico stone, or such like substance."[39] This is mere acceptance of certain basic theories of the *Meteorologica*.[40] Acosta is sure that volcanic flames are not hell fire, as Basil and others taught, because hell fire is without light. The knotty problem of why the sea coast was most subject to earthquakes was solved by Aristotelian principles:

> the reason is, in my iudgement, for that the water dooth stop the conduites and passages of the earth, by which the hote exhalations should passe, which are engendered there. And also the humiditie thickning the superficies of the earth dooth cause the fumes and hot exhalations to goe close together and incounter violently in the bowells of the earth, which doe afterwards breake forth.[41]

Earthquakes, in fact, were of much interest to the later colonial writers, particularly after New England had been severely shaken in 1727 and 1755.[42] The hypothesis that earthquake motion is undulatory or wave-like appears to have been first proposed by Professor John Winthrop, in his *Lecture on Earthquakes* (Boston, 1755),[43] and is an-

---

[38]Cf. John Josselyn, *An Account of Two Voyages to New England* (London, 1674), pp. 224–225. The practical value of good maps makes such interest as this only to be expected.

[39]*History*, I, 177.

[40]Cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–32.

[41]*History*, I, 180.

[42]See William DeLoss Love, *The Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England* (Boston, 1895), pp. 285–295. Cf. also a comment by the present writer in *New England Quarterly, IX*, 28–31 (March, 1936).

[43]See Frederick E. Brasch, in *Sir Isaac Newton, 1727–1927, A Bicentenary Evaluation of His Work* (Baltimore, 1928), p. 319, and

other illustration of how striking phenomena demanded new explanations from American observers.

Acosta's fourth book is divided fairly evenly among his three "mixtures and compounds": metals, plants, and animals. From the point of view of the history of technology and biology, this section is probably the most important of the work, because of its full account of Spanish-American mining processes, and its descriptions of the more unusual American plants and animals.[44] It begins with a little essay in the Scholastic tradition, showing once more Acosta's solid foundation in the natural philosophy of the ancients:

> Mettalls are (as plants) hidden and buried in the bowels of the earth, which have some conformitie in themselves, in the forme and maner of their production; for that wee see and discover even in them, branches, and as it were a bodie, from whence they grow and proceede, which are the greater veines and the lesse, so as they have a knitting in themselves: and it seemes properly that these minerales grow like vnto plants, not that they have any inward vegitative life, being onely proper to plants: but they are engendered in the bowels of the earth, by the vertue and force of the Sunne and other planets, and in long continuance of time they increase and multiply after the manner of plants. And even as mettalls be plants hidden in the earth, so we may say, that plants be living creatures fixed in one place, . . . But living creatures surpasse plants, in that they have a more perfect being; and therefore have neede of a more perfect foode and nourishment; for the search whereof, Nature hath given them a moving and feeling to discover and discerne it. So as the rough and barren earth is as a substance and nutriment for mettalls; and that which is fertile and better seasoned a nourishment for plants. The same plants serve as a nourishment for living creatures, and the plants and living creatures together as a nourishment for men; the inferior nature alwaies serving for the maintenance and sustenation of the superiour, and the lesse perfect yeelding vnto the more perfect: whereby we may see how much it wants, that gold and silver and other things which men so much esteeme by their covetousnesse, should be the happiness of man, . . . who hath

---

cf. A. Wolf, *History of Science, Technology, and Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1939), p. 398.

[44]See T. A. Rickard, *Man and Metals* (New York, 1932), II, 640–711, and Goode, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

been created and made onely to be a subject to serve the vniversall Creator of all things, as his proper end and perfect rest.[45]

This systematic hierarchy of being was curiously persistent; even in the eighteenth century, Cadwallader Colden of New York was writing to John Bartram, the Philadelphia naturalist, that

The Oar or Veins of Minerals are observ'd to grow & to have their sperm or embryo (if I be not mistaken) in a Fluid State. If they grow like other Vegetives they must in time come to a State of Maturity & after that decay & at last dye & come to Corruption.[46]

An account very similar to Acosta's may be found in Alvaro Alonzo Barba's *El Arte de los Metales* (Madrid, 1640), the classic description of the mining methods of New Spain.[47]

Besides accounts of the gold, silver, and mercury mines of Peru, and the methods used to find and refine these metals, Acosta has brief chapters on emeralds and pearls. Throughout these sections he is heavily indebted to the twenty-third book of Pliny's *Historia Naturalis*. His material on plants is divided into comment on those "proper and peculiar to the Indies" and briefer mention of "the rest that are common to the Indies and Europe." He speaks of the planting and the uses of maize, or Indian corn, noting in passing the curious mistake by which it came to be called "Turkie graine,"[48] and he displays the long-enduring kinship of botany with medicine in his assertion that maize is not inferior to wheat "in strength nor substance, but it is more hote and grosse, and engenders more bloud, wherevpon they that have not bin accustomed therevnto, if they eat too much, they swell and become

---

[45]*History*, I, 183–184.

[46]*Collections of the New York Historical Society*, LII (New York, 1919), 26–27.

[47]See the translation by Ross E. Douglas and E. P. Mathewson (New York, 1923), pp. 43–51.

[48]Cf. Edward Eggleston, *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1901), pp. 102–104, 131.

scabbed."[49] The use of maize as food leads him naturally to a full description of cassava bread (made, so Acosta says, from the root of the yucca, as the cassava seems to have been called by the people) and of "Papas" or potatoes.[50] Briefer, but even more interesting, is his comparison of the garden vegetables of Peru with those of Spain. In the latter country, he says, there are radishes, turnips, parsnips, carrots, leeks, garlic, and some other profitable roots, but in New Spain there are so many that he cannot remember them all. He mentions roots of the wood sorrel family ("Ocas," "Yanaocas," and "Cavi"), sweet potatoes ("Camotes" and "Batatas"), peanuts ("Mani" and, perhaps, "Cochuchu"), and the cat-tail ("Totora"), together with some others. Fruits from Europe prosper better in the Indies than Indian plants in Europe, perhaps because the temperature is more even in America. Peruvian onions, garlic, and parsnips are better than those of Spain; turnips grow so abundantly that they can hardly be destroyed to grow corn; radish roots are "as bigge as a mans arme, very tender, and of a good taste." Other native American plants described are the pineapple, the watermelon, the tomato, and the gourd. He did not find any pepper, cloves, cinnamon, nutmeg, or ginger,

> but the naturall spice that God hath given to the West Indies, is that we call in Castille, Indian pepper, and in India, *Axi*, as a generall worde taken from the first land of the Ilands, which they conquered. In the language of Cusco, it is called *Vchu*, and in that of Mexico, *Chili*.[51]

There are full descriptions of the banana tree, the cacao, the maguey, and the cactus, including that variety on which the cochineal insect feeds. Acosta speaks more sparingly of the guava, avocado, passion flower and fruit, and of tobacco, referring those interested to Nicholas

---

[49] *History*, I, 229.

[50] For accounts of these vegetables, and of others mentioned, see Lyman Carrier, *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America* (New York, 1923), pp. 41–88.

[51] *History*, I, 239.

Monardes, *De las Drogas de las Indias* (Seville, 1565),[52] and to special studies, still apparently in manuscript, by Francesco Hernandez and Nardo Antonio Recchi.[53] The general impression conveyed is that plant life flourishes abundantly in the New World, although Acosta admits that some importations, such as cherries, have not done well, "the which I do not impute to want of temperature, for that there is of all sorts, but to carelessness, or that they have not well observed the temperature." His remarks, in short, are an invaluable source of knowledge of Spanish-American agriculture at the end of the sixteenth century, and have been used extensively by commentators on that subject. Economics and natural curiosity urged Acosta's Anglo-American successors to a similar concern with the plants of the New World, so that botany is genally recognized as the leading science of the entire colonial period.[54] It had a prominent place in the literature of exploration and promotion; it attracted a considerable number of fieldworkers and classifiers; it was even graced by a few experimenters who advanced the world's knowledge of hybridization.[55]

Last of all, Acosta describes the animals of the New World, those "carried from Spaine," those "of the same kinde we have in Europe, and yet not carried by the

---

[52]Widely known to English readers in John Frampton's translation, *Joyfull Newes out of the Newe Founde World* (London, 1577).

[53]Hernandez (1517–1587) was the author of *De la Naturaliza y Virtudes de las Plantas, y Animales que Estan Receidos en el Use de Medicine en la Neuva España*, which seems to have been first published at Mexico City in 1615. For Recchi (fl. 1550–1580) and his rather complicated relation to Acosta and Hernandez see the article by Du-Petit-Thouars in the *Biographie Universelle*.

[54]Still useful as a summary is Samuel L. Mitchill, "A Discourse Delivered before the New York Historical Society . . . Embracing a Concise and Comprehensive Account of the Writings Which Illustrate the Botanical History of North and South America," *Coll. N. Y. H. S.*, II (New York, 1814), 149–215.

[55]Cf. two articles by Conway Zirkle: "Some Forgotten Records of Hybridization and Sex in Plants," *Journal of Heredity*, XXIII, 432–448 (November, 1932), and "More Records of Plant Hybridization before Koelreuter," *ibid.*, XXV, 3–18 (January, 1934).

Spaniardes," and those "proper to the Indies, whereof there are none in Spaine." The first class has increased enormously; Acosta hints that fortunes are still being made in hides and wool, almost without exertion. The second class he has spoken of before; that there are lions, tigers, bears, boars, foxes, and other wild beasts in the New World is good evidence that there is some connection by land with the Old, "being impossible to swimme the ocean: and it were a follie to imagine that men had imbarked them with them." Many of these wild beasts, he points out, are slightly unlike the European varieties. The birds, he conceives, might more easily have passed to America. The real problem falls under his third heading:

> It were a matter more difficult to shew and prove, what beginning many and sundry sorts of beasts had, which are found at the Indies, of whose kindes we have none in this continent. For if the Creator had made them there, wee may not then alleadge nor flie to Noahs Arke, neither was it then necessary to save all sorts of birds and beasts, if others were to be created anew. Moreover, wee could not affirme that the creation of the world was made and finished in sixe days, if there were yet other kinds to make, and specially perfit beasts, and no lesse excellent than those that are knowen vnto vs. If we say then that all these kinds of creatures were preserved in the Arke by Noah, it followes that those beasts, of whose kindes we finde not any but at the Indies, have passed thither from this continent, as we have said of other beasts that are knowne vnto vs. This supposed, I demand how it is possible that none of their kinde should remaine heere? and how they are found there, being as it were travellers and strangers. Truly it is a question that hath long held me in suspense.[56]

As Andrew Dickson White has shown, the old theological theories of the number of species and their geographical distribution were soon to be overthrown by just such evidence as this.[57] "It may be," Acosta suggests, "God hath made a new creation of beasts." Or it may be that, although all came out of the ark, diverse kinds dispersed themselves into the most suitable regions. Acosta is not

---

[56]*History*, I, 277.

[57]See White, *op. cit.*, I, 44–49.

too sure that the latter theory is the better one, an uncertainty that led Samuel Purchas, in a long footnote in his reprint of the discussion, to emphasize the more orthodox position. Purchas says unequivocally that

> The same providence which brought all beasts and fowles from all their native diversified residences thorow all the world to the Arke (which no naturall instinct in such antipathies and at once, could doe) and kept them safe in the Arke, did also dispose them to their designed abodes after. For I hold it unchristian with Mercator to say, America was not drowned with the Floud. . . . In things above nature (as is both the historie and mysterie of the Arke) we must flee necessarily to a supernaturall cause.[58]

The problem perceived by Acosta was to trouble Americans for many generations. Cotton Mather touched upon it in *Work upon the Ark* (Boston, 1689), where he sought to explain how Noah stored away all the animals and their food.[59] Elsewhere he shows awareness of uncertainty of the number of species.[60] The best example of the later importance of the matter is, however, the discussion of the American mastodon, or mammoth, beginning in 1752, when fossil teeth from Big Bone Lick, on the Ohio River, came to the attention of European naturalists.[61] The speculations which followed, participated in by such American thinkers as John Bartram and Benjamin Franklin, may be reviewed in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society of London, or in summaries in Buffon's *Epoques*. So assured was the eighteenth century of the constancy of species that even Thomas Jefferson could write: "Such is the economy of nature, that no instance can be produced, of her having permitted any one race of her animals to become extinct."[62] The point, once more, is that

---

[58]*Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Hakluyt Society Publications (Glasgow, 1906), XV, 133.

[59]See *op. cit.*, pp. 28–29.

[60]See *American Literature*, VI, 415–416 (January, 1935).

[61]See *Gentleman's Magazine*, XXII, 301 (July, 1752).

[62]*Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. P. L. Ford, III (New York, 1894), 144.

the whole discussion illustrates Acosta's astuteness in perceiving significant problems.

Like all the early travelers, Acosta was mightily impressed with the number and strangeness of the birds and beasts of the Indies. He describes the humming bird, the condor, the turkey buzzard, the macaw, and the sea fowl whose dung, guano, so wonderfully fattens the ground. He points out the singularities of the peccary, the tapir, the armadillo, the iguana, the chinchilla, the guinea pig. Indian monkeys are given a whole chapter, including "the fooleries, tricks, traverses, and pleasant sportes they make when they are taught, which seem not to come from brute beasts, but from a manlike vnderstanding."[63] He deals with the various varieties of the llama at some length, distinguishing the vicuna, the alpaca, and the guanaco. From the last of these is obtained the bezoar stone, whose medicinal virtues had been celebrated from remote antiquity, when it had to be brought from Persia. Acosta, to his credit, is more concerned with the usefulness of llamas for wool and meat and burden-carrying than in the lore of the bezoar stone, which Monardes had handled before him.

So much for the content of Acosta's four books on the natural history of the Indies, written, as has been said, to correct the errors of Scholastic science in the light of the new evidence from America. As has been shown, much of his work was descriptive, and in his curiosity about strange plants and animals and their possible economic uses he is representative rather than distinctive. To be sure, he was more than ordinarily familiar with the backgrounds of ancient and medeival science, a fact which made him discriminating in his selection of things to be described and systematic in his treatment of them. His unique qualities, however, derive from his having been a scientific theorist, curious about the puzzles presented by the phenomena he had observed and not unduly respectful of "the ancient and received Philosophy." He went

[63] *History*, I, 285.

beyond mere observation to develop and weigh scientific hypotheses, naive now, perhaps, but by no means naive at the time he wrote or in the two centuries thereafter.

One cannot but be impressed, indeed, with the way in which Acosta's speculations foreshadowed most of the main directions of colonial science. His interest in geography, his curiosity about the aborigines, his concern with meteorology and climatology, his speculations about the number and distribution of species—all these are characteristic of his successors in the English colonies to the north. Nowhere else, perhaps, can one find them altogether; the English, surely, produced no such sweeping view of the problems posed by the observed facts of the New World. It is not too much to say, therefore, that Acosta is the best available guide to the source and the growth of the colonial scientific tradition, a tradition thus far imperfectly understood.

How important that tradition is must be suggested elsewhere. Suffice it to say here that a surprising number of Americans, in New Spain and British America alike, shared Acosta's desire to reconcile an inheritance of knowledge with the evidence of the senses, and believed, as as he did, that

> He that takes delight to vnderstand the wondrous works of Nature shal taste the true pleasure and content of Histories; and the more, whenas he shal know they are not the simple works of men, but of the Creator himself, and that he shall comprehend the naturall causes of these works, then shall he truly occupie himselfe in the studie of Philosophie.[64]

---

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

PAULDING'S PROSE TREATMENT OF TYPES AND FRONTIER LORE BEFORE COOPER

By W. T. Conklin

James Kirke Paulding has received just consideration for his treatment of American scenes and sources in such novels as *Koningsmarke* (1823), *The Dutchman's Fireside* (1831), and *The Old Continental* (1846), but I find no recognition of his having presented American types and American frontier lore before the appearance of Cooper's novels. Cooper did not enter wholeheartedly into description of frontier life until *The Pioneers,* of 1823. Paulding had begun his literary career in 1807–8 by collaborating with Irving in the famous *Salmagundi;* from then on he had worked independently, contributing articles to the *Analectic Magazine,* and producing separate works, mostly satirical.

Paulding's inclination to satire, together with the critics' fondness for classifying authors of the period as either classical or romantic, directs attention away from content and centers it upon Paulding's dislike of foreign romanticism. One critic writes of him thus:

> His literary life until 1824 became a series of *Salmagundi*-like satires aimed at Scott and at Great Britain generally. . . . All are satires.[1]

Although it must be admitted that this critic does not include periodical material in his list, even a cursory reading of the most important prose work of this period of Paulding's writing—*Letters from the South* (1817)—reveals not only satire, but a careful interest in American types and local anecdotes.

My purpose here is to demonstrate that even during this early period of his writing, before Cooper's novels were

---

[1]Fred Lewis Pattee, *The First Century of American Literature, 1770–1870* (New York, 1935), pp. 289–290.

conceived, Paulding was not merely a satirist, but a practical exponent of the already spreading doctrine of American themes for American authors. Since his use of American scenery has been discussed in nearly every critical and historical volume in which his name is mentioned, I confine my attention to his portrayal of types, frontier narrative involving woodlore, and frontier anecdotes which would to-day be classified as folklore.

The earliest example, "The Lost Traveller," appeared in the *Analectic Magazine* for August, 1814.[2] The author introduces the tale by a careful indication of the conditions under which it was told him, in a room at an inn, in "one of those little white villages that have sprung up as if by enchantment along the Genesee river." Comment on the rapid development of the region leads his chance acquaintance to remark that he knew it years before as a wildnerness. "About seventeen years ago," he begins, "I was returning from New York to Canada, where I then lived, by way of Lake Ontario; but on reaching the lake I found that all the vessels were laid up for the season. My only alternative was either to return, or take the route through what was then called the Tonewanta swamp." Having explained the necessity of making the trip despite difficulties, the traveller begins enlarging upon the obstacles with which he was confronted, among them "a forest of one hundred miles, with only a single habitation—a hut about twenty miles from the Genesee river."

---

[2]Pp. 158–162. In the *Analectic* for January, 1814, appeared a review (reprinted from *The Eclectic* for August, 1813) of Stoddard's *Sketches, Historical and Descriptive, of Louisiana,* beginning: "If other indications of the national character would warrant us, we should be willing to impute it to a republican dislike of ostentation, that the Americans have hitherto made so little literary use of their originally immense territory. . ." Except for a review of *Pike's Exploratory Travels,* a strongly sympathetic essay called "Traits of Indian Character," both of February, 1814, and "Philip of Pokanoket: An Indian Memoir," of June, 1814, the *Analectic* appears not generally to have concerned itself with frontier lore. It is significant, however, that a periodical so largely concerned with foreign literary items should have manifested an interest in the pieces named.

In the portion immediately following, Paulding introduces a subject which, one discovers from frequent mention of him in later works, was very dear to his heart[3]—the backwoodsman: "There was a sort of Indian road through the swamp, which, in summer, a man might explore on horseback, but which, when covered with snow, none but an Indian, or a backwoodsman, could find out." The traveller sets out "in company with a little, stout Dutchman."

> It was a bitter cold day, the 15th of December, and the snow lay on the ground about six inches deep; yet we went on briskly for some time, guided by the marks of the trees, till we had walked about fifteen miles, when, some how or other, we deviated into an Indian track, which we followed for a considerable distance.

They become lost, preparing to spend the night in the shelter of the upturned roots of a fallen hemlock. Confronted by the problem of building a fire, and having "a large jack knife and a flint, but no tinder," the traveller remembers having accidentally scorched his handkerchief the night before. After half an hour's suspense, he succeeds in producing a flame and kindles a fire of rather startling proportions. They decide to stand watch, taking turns, lest the fire go out. The Dutchman is first to watch, falls asleep, and is revived by the awakening traveller. The return of daylight brings the discovery that they are but half a mile from the village they left the day before.

Crude though the story is, it nevertheless depends for its effect upon the rather too obvious effort to create suspense, the suggestion of resourcefulness in the face of imminent death in the woods, and the delineation of the frontier scene.

A second example of Paulding's enthusiasm for frontier material appeared in the *Analectic Magazine* for October,

---

[3]Of the race inhabiting the Mississippi valley, Paulding wrote: "Should I personify this people, I would say—The Backwoodsman is a soldier from necessity. Mind and body have been disciplined in practical warfare. He belongs to the continent, and to no other. He is an original . . . He is the genius of the new world."—W. I. Paulding, *The Literary Life of James K. Paulding* (New York, 1867), p. 342.

1815.[4] Entitled "The Adventures of Henry Bird," it purports to be the history of hardships on the frontier and among the Indians of one Henry Bird, who eventually found his way to Washington to seek aid for white women captives among the Indians. Paulding tells the story with a simplicity and directness too often lacking in some of his later attempts at handling the same themes.

Bird, the account runs, settled at "the head waters of the Sandusky, in the state of Ohio," building the usual log hut for himself and his family. Paulding recounts in detail the animals that roamed the forest and Bird's adventures with them. The Indians, led by a chief known as The Big Captain, were at first friendly. In 1811, however, after the battle of Tippecanoe, the Indians suddenly disappeared, and the settlers, realizing that their disappearance meant danger, gathered together for protection. The attack which followed, Paulding handles with apparent relish, even to arranging the details within the cabin. Nineteen people had gathered at the time; Bird lay resting on a bed; his wife was preparing meat at the fireplace. Eight rifles were fired into the group at once, and in the subsequent struggle all but Bird were killed. He was brutally hacked by the Indians, who, finding him still alive the next morning, took him with them to their encampment. After his recovery he attempted escape, was recaptured and tortured:

> They tied him down on his back, with his feet fastened to a stake, and the Big Captain seized a fire-brand, which he held first against his hand, then against his arm, taunting him at the same time, by asking, "if he intended to run away soon?" This was done by others in turn, for thirteen different times, at intervals of half an hour, and sometimes of an hour, so that he might be as susceptible as possible. The intervals were filled up with dancings, tauntings, and expressions of contempt for white men. . . . This ceremony continued till within about two hours of sunset, at which time the fingers of his right hand were almost consumed, and his arm burnt to the bone. I saw his hand and arm myself, or I could never have been brought to believe that human nature could have endured such long suffering.

[4] Pp. 295–301.

Bird was finally rescued by a Scot named Randall McDonald, a trader on friendly terms with the Indians, who purchased him from them for a gallon of rum, took him back to civilization, got him a surgeon, and gave him money to travel back east.

As early, then, as 1815 Paulding was actively engaged in experimenting with tales of frontiersmen and Indians; the attention to detail and the emphasis upon pioneer character display a conscious artistry.

Two years later, in 1817, appeared *Letters from the South,* a series of impressions "written during an excursion in the summer of 1816." In addition to its frequent satire, directed not only against Britain, but against many an American trait or custom odious to Paulding, this two-volume work abounds, as previously remarked, in description of American types and folk anecdotes. It will be possible here to cite only a few examples.

Among the more entertaining descriptions of native types is that in the account of an enforced stop at a dilapidated home in the mountains of Virginia:

> After "travelling, and travelling, and travelling," as the story-books say, we came at last to a stately two-story house, which we could see by the moonlight, was magnificently bedecked with old petticoats stuck in the window panes. . . . We alighted and knocked at the door of this castle of desolation; when out came, not a dwarf, but a giant at least seven feet high. He took our horses, and we went into the house, where the rest of his family of giants, seven in number, were seated round a table loaded with a mighty supper of bread, meat, and vegetables, not forgetting the bacon. Two women, of the like enormous stature, were waiting upon the gentlemen. . . .
>
> The group round the table consisted of an old man, whose countenance, to say the honest truth, was not quite so amiable as one might see of a summer's day—and six young fellows, that looked as if the forest itself would bow before them—if they were only armed with axes. These are the lads to go in front of the great caravan of man, in his progress to the west—to clear the lands, to hunt the deer, to war against wild beasts, and cope with the savage, equally wild.[5]

---

[5]*Letters from the South* (New York, 1817), I, 173–174.

In Virginia, too, Paulding was impressed by the hunters who brought into the towns the fruit of their hard life in the mountains:

> Here, too, the hunters are seen coming down with their deer to sell; for the mountains in this region abound—with mighty hunters before the Lord—who cultivate a little land, and hunt a great deal. These are the people to make soldiers of; for they endure more hardships, and encounter more fatigues to kill one deer, than would kill twenty of the stoutest *bucks* in all Christendom. In the morning they are at their posts in the pathless mountains, in the depths of winter; often all night out; and often bewildered in these recesses for two or three days. They are patient of cold and hunger—but don't bear thirst well, and always carry a bottle of whiskey. It is an utter disgrace to one of these mountain spirits, to draw the blood of a squirrel in killing it; they just hit the bark to which he clings, and bring him down by the shock, stone dead, without touching the body, or breaking the skin.[6]

Here, surely, is not only a study of a type, but a definite interest in the lore of the hunter—the killing of a squirrel in this manner was the very sort of woodlore later to appeal to Cooper.

The last of my examples are frontier anecdotes, including narrative of the "tall tale" order. "Mine host the Dutchman" tells such a tale to a gathering of hunters just returned from a fox hunt in the Valley of the Shenandoah:

> It took him three-quarters of an hour; for, like a true story-teller, he made the most of it, being doubtless the best story he had to his back. The snake was as *tick* as his *tigh*, and ran after him, bellowing just like a calf six months old—and *den* he came close up behind him, —and *den*, you may depend, he was scared; but *den*, for all *dat*, he turned round upon the snake *wid* his rifle, and fired right in his face, and killed him, you may depend. Every body wondered at his story, and believed it, as in duty bound,—for he was their landlord, who kept the key of the whiskey, and was of course a person of consequence.[7]

Another snake story occurs in Volume II of the *Letters from the South:*

---

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 199–200.
[7] *Ibid.*, I, 163.

As I had heard much of the rattlesnakes and moccasins that infest these regions, I was on the look out for them during this little excursion; but I did not meet a single one, nor do I believe they are by any means common. But I must tell you a story I heard from an honest man, at whose cabin I stopt awhile to rest myself along the brook. . . .

He told me, that somewhat more than six miles off, in the recesses of one of the most unfrequented mountains, there was a deep, circular valley, the bottom of which is covered with loose, flat stones that have fallen down its steep sides. A gentleman on a visit to the springs once hired him and another person, a hunter, to accompany him to this valley, in order to ascertain whether the stories he had heard, but disbelieved, about it, were true. They descended it, but without seeing a single snake; and the gentleman began to banter the hunter, who told him to stamp hard upon the flat stone where he was standing. He did so, and presently a good dozen rattlesnakes came out, to see who knocked at the door, I suppose. Alarmed at the sight of the strangers, the snakes began to sound their rattles like so many Philadelphia watchmen waked from a sound sleep, and thereupon came forth several thousands of these reptiles, who rattled and hissed at such an execrable rate, that they were glad enough to retreat out of the valley with all convenient expedition. The tanner moreover added, that there was a great smell of cucumbers, and that for his part he did not much mind the rattlers, being used to them, but he could not reconcile himself to the looks of a rascally fellow, the like of which he had never seen before, who carried a great fin on his back, was shaped like a sunfish, and hissed ten times louder than his neighbors. The existence of a valley somewhere in this part of the world, containing a vast number of rattlesnakes, is believed by many well-informed people; but as to the little fellow with the fin, his being must remain a matter of doubt for the present.[8]

As a final example of the sort of anecdote to which Paulding was attracted, there is the story of the fight between the batteauxman and the wagoner:

One summer evening . . . the battleauxman fastened his boat to the stump of a tree, lighted his fire to broil his bacon, and began to sing that famous song of "The opossum up the gum-tree." By and by a west country wagoner chanced to come jingling his bells that way, and stopping his wagon, unhooked his horses, carried them round to the little trough at the back of his vehicle, gave them some *shorts*, sat himself down at the top of the bank, below which the batteauxman was sitting in his boat, and began to whistle "The

[8] *Ibid.*, II, 6, 10–11.

batteauxman robb'd the old woman's henroost." The batteauxman cocked his eye up at the wagoner, and the wagoner, looking askance down on the batteauxman, took a chew of tobacco with a leer that was particularly irritating. The batteauxman drew out his whiskey bottle, took a drink, and put the cork in again, at the same time thrusting his tongue in his cheek in a manner not to be borne. The wagoner flapped his hands against his hips, and crowed like a cock; the batteauxman curved his neck, and neighed like a horse. . . . In a few minutes the wagoner swore "he had the handsomest sweetheart of any man in all Greenbriar." The batteauxman jumped up in a passion, but sat down and took a drink. In a few minutes the wagoner swore "he had the finest horse of any man in a hundred miles." The batteauxman bounced up, pulled the waistband of his trowsers, took another drink, and bounced down again. A minute after the wagoner swore "he had a better rifle than any man that ever wore a blue jacket." This was too much . . . Besides, to attack a man's rifle! He could have borne any reflection on his sweetheart or his horse; but to touch his rifle was to touch his honor.[9]

It appears, from these instances that Paulding ought to have a place among those writers of travel books contributing to the popularization not only of the American scene but to that of the folk tale as well. That Paulding might have invented the two snake stories previously cited is highly possible; that he could have invented the story of the batteauxman and the wagoner, with its detailed account of frontier repartee,[10] without at least a fair knowledge of the language and manners of frontier characters, derived in some way from reading or observation, appears highly improbable. A. L. Herold, in his *James Kirke Paulding, Versatile American,* comparing *Letters from the South* with other travel books, such as Dwight's *Travels in New England and New York,* finds that Paulding's work belongs "in the same class," but is much inferior to them. Perhaps it is this feeling that led him to find "little narration"[11] in the two volumes of *Letters from the*

[9]*Ibid.*, II, 90–91.

[10]Cf. Walter Blair, *Native American Humor* (New York, 1937), pp. 30–35. Although Blair mentions Paulding, he does not consider him from the point of view here taken and, especially, does not consider *Letters from the South.*

[11]Herold, *James Kirke Paulding, Versatile American* (New York, 1926), p. 58.

South, and so to neglect such significant narrative as I have endeavored to point out.

Paulding's two volumes contain other pictures of American types, other anecdotes heard along the way. Their significance lies not in their merit as descriptive pieces or specimens of the story-teller's art, but in their having struck Paulding as the stuff of which American literature should eventually be made. He urged continually that the only proper themes for American authors lay within their own country[12] and went actively about the business of examining and collecting materials. By the time he began putting them to use in novels, Cooper was already on his way to fame.

---

[12]E.g., "Will not the Muse of this new world, think you, one day or other, awaken in these beautiful scenes, and illustrate them in strains that will make them classical at some future period, like those of Italy, Greece, and Scotland? . . . As yet we have not struck the harp whose strings vibrate in unison with the chords of our hearts. The genius that has awakened in our country, is not the genius of America, but a mongrel imitative creature, expatriated in his affections, and incapable of connecting the poetry of the country with the feelings, attachments, and associations of the people for whom he affects to write. . . . He who wishes for a lasting fame, must write for his countrymen, and not for foreign critics."—*Letters from the South,* II, 256–257. Paulding also expressed this conviction in his preface to *The Backwoodsman* (Philadelphia, 1818): "His object was to indicate to the youthful writers of his native country, the rich poetic sources with which it abounds, as well as to call their attention *home,* for the means of attaining to novelty of subject, if not to originality in style or sentiment."

WALT WHITMAN'S READING OF DANTE

By Joseph Chesley Mathews

Walt Whitman, writing in "A Backward Glance o'er Travel'd Roads" (published in 1888) of the reading he did as a young and middle-aged man when he went on his excursions into the country or to Long Island's sea-shores, said that he read Dante, "mostly in an old wood."[1] In another place[2] he recorded the date of this his first reading of Dante, and his first impressions of that reading:

> Spring of '59 read Dante's *Inferno*. It is one of those works (unlike the Homeric and Shakespearean) that make an intense impression on the susceptibilities of an age,[3] or two or three ages of the peculiar temper fitted by previous training and surrounding influences to absorb it and be mastered by its strength. But as what it grows out of and needs present for its understanding and love has passed quite away it has also passed away. It rests entirely on the fame it achieved under circumstances fitted to it.
>
> The points of the *Inferno* (I am giving my first impressions) are *hasting on*, great vigor, a lean and muscular ruggedness; no superfluous flesh;[4] and the fascination there always is in a well told tragedy, no matter how painful or repulsive. It signifies, in its way, that melancholy and imperious part of humanity, or its elements, out of which the whole structure of the stern and vindictive Jehovahn theology has arisen—from the time of the primitive Jews down—vengeance, gloating in the agony of sinners, bad men, enemies to be punished, and the usual distinctions of good and evil.

---

[1]Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*, Book-Lover's Camden ed. (New York and London, 1902), III, 55.

[2]See "Preparatory Reading and Thought," §47, in *The Complete Prose Works of Walt Whitman*, Book-Lovers' Camden ed. (New York and London, 1902), VI, 91–93.

[3]Whitman's impressions of the work may have been original with him; however, it should be pointed out that in a comment quoted by John A. Carlyle ("Preface" to his translation of the *Inferno*, New York, 1849, p. xxiii) one reads: "The great Poem . . . must have taken a more direct and earnest hold of the age from which it comes, than any other poem, ancient or modern." As we shall see later, it was Carlyle's translation that Whitman read.

[4]Compare also, in Carlyle, "The . . . poem . . . can have had no superfluous words" (*loc.cit.*).

It is a short poem. Dante's whole works appear to lie in a very moderate compass.[5] It seems strange that he should stand as the highest type of Italian imaginative art-execution in literature—so gaunt, so haggard and unrich, un-joyous. But the real Italian art-execution flourishes of course in other fields—in music, for instance, peerless in the whole earth, teaching high over the heads of all lands, all times.

Mark the simplicity of Dante,[6] like the Bible's—different from the tangled and florid Shakespeare. Some of his idioms must, in Italian, cut like a knife. He narrates like some short-worded, superb, illiterat —an old farmer or some New England blue-light minister or common person interested in telling his or her story—makes the impression of bona fide in all that he says, as if it were certainly so. I do not wonder that the middle ages thought he had indeed really descended into Hell and seen what he described.[7]

Mark, I say, his economy of words—perhaps no other writer ever equal to him. One simple trail of idea, epical, makes the poem—all else resolutely ignored. This alone shows the master. In this respect is the most perfect in all literature. A great study for diffuse moderns.

Dante's other principal work, the *Paradiso*, I have not read. In it, I believe, Beatrice, a pure and beautiful woman, conducts him through Heaven—as Virgil has conducted him through Hell. Probably he does not succeed so well in giving heavenly pictures.

What is more effective conforming to the vulgar and extreme coarsely rank pattern of Hell than the tableaux in the "ninth circle," where two brothers that have hated and murdered each other are made to continually "butt" each other by their heads, steeped in mud, ice and filth.

Several details in his last paragraph (the ninth circle, the two brothers, their being steeped in ice, their butting each other by their heads)[8] show that he had read Canto XXXII

---

[5]Cf. "The . . . poem . . . is . . . distinguished for its intense brevity" (*loc.cit.*), and "The whole works of Dante . . . might be comprised in two moderate volumes" (*ibid.*, p. xxii).

[6]Cf. "The language . . . has a tone of plain familiarity" (*ibid.*, p. xxiii).

[7]Cf. the legend, recorded in §XX of Boccaccio's *Vita di Dante*, that one day in Verona a woman remarked to her companions, as Dante was passing by, "Vedete colui che va nell' inferno, e torna quando gli piace, e qua su reca novelle di coloro che lá giú sono?" (G. Boccaccio, *Il Comento alla Divina Commedia*, Gius. Laterza & Figli, Bari, 1918, vol. I, p. 33).

[8]*Inf.* XXXII, 40–60.

of the *Inferno;* and the initial statement of his comment seems to say that he had read all of the *Inferno.*[9] But he had done no more than that, although he did have some idea of what the *Paradiso* was about.[10] We know, moreover, that his reading was done in translation, for "he read no language but English."[11]

After reading in his "Notes on the Meaning and Intention of *Leaves of Grass*" his rule, "Make no quotations and no reference to any other writers,"[12] we do not expect to find in his poems much evidence of his knowledge of Dante, or influence from Dante,—and we don't. In the "Song of the Exposition" (1871) he spoke of "shades of Virgil and Dante"; in "To get the Final Lilt of Songs" (1888) and "Old Chants" (1891) he named Dante among a number of the great poets and poems of the past.[13] But in his prose we find more. In some miscellaneous notes[14] written at various times Whitman mentioned Dante in six places. In one of these he showed a little hesitation before accepting a magazine writer's rating of Chaucer as the

---

[9]The fact, too, that the episode he mentioned appears near the end of the *Inf.* suggests that he had read all of it.

[10]What he says about the *Paradiso* and Beatrice he might have derived from Carlyle's note 22 to *Inf.* I, and from the text of *Inf.* I, 121ff., and II, 52–126. Of the *Purgatorio,* curiously, he seems to have been unaware, although it is spoken of in *Inf.* I, 118–120, XIV, 136–138, XXVI, 133–135, and XXXIV, 124–126, and mentioned by Carlyle in notes 22, 23, and 24 to Canto I, note 23 to Canto XIV, note 28 to Canto XXVI, notes 12 and 24 to Canto XXXIV, and in several other notes in other cantos. In his introduction, too, Carlyle has referred to "the three great divisions" of Dante's poem, and to Prince John of Saxony's translation of the *Inferno, Purgatorio,* and *Paradiso* in three volumes (*op. cit.,* pp. xxx, xxvii).

[11]R. M. Bucke, *Walt Whitman* (London, 1883), p. 52.

[12]*Prose,* VI, 4; see also *ibid.,* VI, 34f.

[13]*Leaves of Grass,* I, 239; II, 307; III, 15.

[14]These notes were collected by Whitman's editor from scrapbooks and bundles containing MS notes, magazine articles, and newspaper clippings; the dates for the notes are unknown, except that they extend from the forties to the seventies or eighties (*Prose,* VI, p. xv). One of the clippings was a newspaper report of a lecture by Milburn on "Dante and Milton" (*Prose,* VII, 81).

equal of Dante, but would not quarrel about it.[16] In another note he jotted down (copying from some work, it seems, since he used quotation marks) "The Story of Dante's 'Journey through Hell,' " and listed "Dante, born 1265," as one of the "three great narrative poets of Italy."[17] In another he spoke of " 'The lurid fire of Dante' " (quoting again); wrote down, "Dante . . . 'Master of heaven [hell], of purgatory and of paradise, owning them by right of genius,—he could bestow situation upon friend or foe, in any of them' "; and then (still quoting) spoke of Dante as the greatest contributor to the formation of the Italian language, and as the giver to it of nerve and dignity.[18] And in the other three notes[19] he simply mentioned Dante's name—in one instance along with several other great writers and literary works. In four other instances, too, in his prose, he spoke of the *Inferno,* or of "Dante's utterance," in connection with the *Cid, Nibelungenlied,* Homer's work, Shakespeare's, and so on.[20]

In 1862 he filled one page of a note-book with bits of information about Dante and the *Divine Comedy;* and these notes show that he was reading the Preface to Carlyle's *Inferno* and Canto I.[21] Then in a letter dated at

---

[16]*Prose,* VI, 86. He refused to grant that Chaucer was as great as Homer or Shakespeare, but granted that he was easily as great as Spencer [*sic*] and Milton.

[17]*Prose,* VII, 11.

[18]*Prose,* VII, 14. The phrase "lurid fire of Dante" had been used by Thomas Carlyle in 1827 (Toynbee, *Dante in English Literature,* London, 1909, II, 481); but I do not find Whitman's other phrases in Carlyle. Brackets are Whitman's or his editor's. Here Whitman used the word "purgatory"; see note 9.

[19]*Prose,* VI, 90, 119, 210.

[20]In "Lacks and Wants Yet," from *Collect* (1882–83), "A Thought on Shakespeare" (1886), & "An Old Man's Rejoinder" (1890)—*Prose,* II, 292; III, 124, 125, 284.

[21]Mr. C. I. Glicksberg, who called my attention to the existence of this page of notes (a copy of which I give below), says that "Even during the storm and stress of the war Whitman did not abandon the reading of the books that he loved" (*Walt Whitman and the Civil War,* Philadelphia, 1933, p. 82, note 51). The notes are in a manuscript note-book stamped with gold "1862" in the Harned Collection

Washington, [D.C.,] March 19, 1863, he wrote of what he saw of the Civil War,—"not Virgil showing Dante on and on among the agonized and damned, approach what here I see and take part in";[22] and, in a note written in 1871 and published in the "Meaning and Intention of *Leaves of Grass*," he spoke of "the phantom of the Roman bard" who "accompanied Dante on his difficult and untried way."[23] Again, in "Democratic Vistas" (published in 1871) he named Dante as one of the great literary geniuses, and spoke of him as "stalking with lean form, nothing but fibre, not a grain of superfluous flesh."[24] In

---

in the Library of Congress (*ibid.*, p. 3). The source of every item of them, save the observation that the poem is in terza rima, his wish to see the *Paradise*, and the statement that he had seen Doré's illustrations of Dante, I have located in Carlyle's *Inferno* (see pp. 14, note 1; ix; x; xiii; xi, note 1; xix; xxii; xxvi; xxxiv). The notes are as follows:

The Inferno
the work is in rhyme "terza rima"
The action of the poem begins on Good Friday, year 1300—
Dante was at that time 35 years of age.
(it seems to have been known soon)
Of course it was for a long time (over a century and a half) in MSS. only –more than 200 yet exist—the British Museum has one or more, &c
first printed edition—1472
a good copy Italian text in British Museum
first edition with the title "divina commedia" 1516 at Venice
Dante's own comparison of the styles &c of tragedy and comedy
1373—the republic of Florence set apart an annual sum of 100 florins for lectures on Dante—
Boccaccio was the first lecturer
"The whole works of Dante, in prose and verse, may be comprised in two moderate volumes—when separated from the unwieldly notes &c."
Dante died 1321—aged 56
See the other book of Dante "the Paradise"
Sept. '62—looked carefully over the quarto Dore's illustrations of Dante—very, very fine—yet some of them too melodramatic

[22] Emory Holloway, *Whitman* (New York and London, 1926), p. 202.

[23] *Prose*, VI, 21.

[24] *Prose*, II, 118. His words remind one of lines 1–3 in the twenty-fifth canto of the *Paradiso;* although he had not read that poem, he probably had read in Carlyle's introduction to the *Inferno* (p. xxxiv) the following: "the 'Sacred Poem for many years has made him lean' (*Parad.* xxv. 3)." See also the second paragraph of the quotation I have given from Whitman at the beginning of this paper.

"Scenes on Ferry and River—Last Winter's Nights" (written in 1879) he spoke of "far shafts" of "terrible, ghastly-powerful" flames and lights he saw along the river as "Dante-Inferno gleams."[25] Writing again of the Civil War, in "The Million Dead, too, Summ'd Up" (published in 1882–83), and speaking of "the prison-pens of Andersonville, Salisbury, Belle Isle, &c.," which he called the "blackest and loathsomest of all, the dead and living burial pits," he said: "not Dante's pictured hell and all its woes, its degradations, filthy torments, excell'd those prisons."[26] And writing in "Art Features" (published in 1882–83) of the mountains of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, and California, he said: ". . . here start up in every conceivable presentation of shape, these . . . piles, coping the skies, emanating a beauty, terror, power, more than Dante or Angelo ever knew."[27]

In a letter dated August 2, 1885, William Roscoe Thayer described an hour spent with Walt Whitman the preceding week; he said:

> [I] mentioned that I hoped some time to write a history of the struggle of the Italians for independence. He [Whitman] seemed interested: asked many pertinent questions, about the character of the Italians, the pope—whose influence he thought was slight—and about Dante. He had read the *Divine Comedy* in Carlyle's translation, and in Longfellow's, but he could not quite understand Dante's great position among poets and in the history of Italy. "But I feel sure," he said, "that the trouble lies with me. I haven't got the right clue. If I knew more it would be clear to me." This was his attitude through all our talk. He made no hasty conclusion, but habitually spoke as if he had not sufficient data for arriving at a decisive judgment.[28]

---

[25] *Prose*, I, 230.

[26] *Prose*, I, 137. This may have been written about the end of 1865; at least, it was based upon notes written at that time (see *Prose*, I, 3, 4, 132, 133).

[27] *Prose*, I, 263. In 1879 he made a journey into the Western States.

[28] *The Letters of William Roscoe Thayer*, ed. C. D. Hazen (Boston, 1926), p. 35. Carlyle translated, not all of the *Divina Commedia*, but only the *Inferno*. Longfellow's translation of the complete work was published in 1867. I have found no indication, other than Thayer's remark, that Whitman ever read the Longfellow translation.

Then on May 5, 1888, Horace Traubel said to Whitman: "I will be honest. I don't care much for Milton or Dante." Whitman laughed: "I'll be honest, too. I don't care for them either. I like the moderns better."[29] And on July 21, 1888, Whitman gave to Traubel a Dante portrait which Symonds had once sent him. His comments on this picture[30] are interesting, for they show something more of his opinion of Dante:

> The face is wonderfully clean-cut, the face of a man who was quits with the impurities of life. To get that in a face much has to be lost as well as won. Dante is unquestionably one of the first-class men, if there are classes in men: he is up on the peak—high up: emancipated, in a way, from the tendencies of the flesh. I do not make too much of that—attach any exclusive importance to it: the flesh, too, has its divine (who knows, maybe the divinest) uses: still, the Dantesque sort of man is vital, must be reckoned with, stands in this thing or that for the supreme ideals. They are not my ideals but they are ideals—very lofty ideals.

On October 25, 1888, Whitman referred to Dante's "knotty, gnarled" quality;[31] and for the last time mentioned his name in "Some Personal and Old Age Jottings" (written in 1891): in naming over some of the books that lay about in his room, he included "John Carlyle's *Dante.*"[32] This was the same volume, it would seem, that he had used since 1859: the biographer Dr. Bucke wrote in 1883, "[Whitman] thinks much of Dr. John A. Carlyle's translation of Dante's 'Inferno,' has had the volume by him for many years, reads in it often, and told me he had learned very much from it, especially in conciseness—'no surplus flesh,' as he describes it."[33]

We see, then, that Whitman read the *Inferno*, presumably all of it, in Carlyle's translation, in 1859. And,

---

[29]Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden* (New York, 1908), I, 105.

[30]Recorded by Traubel, *op. cit.*, II, 24. The portrait was copied from a fine lithograph (published by the Arundel Society) of the fresco portrait painted by Giotto.

[31]Traubel, *op. cit.*, II, 532.

[32]*Prose*, IV, 60f.

[33]Bucke, *Whitman*, p. 65.

although he once remarked that he did not care for Dante, it appears, from his own notes on and references to the *Inferno,* that he went back to it and read in it during the years of the Civil War; and, from the testimony of Dr. Bucke, that he kept the work by him for many years and read in it often. And it has been said that he read also Longfellow's translation of the *Divina Commedia.* What he seems to have meant by admitting that he did not care for Dante was that in some respects the *Inferno* was uncongenial to him. He disliked the theology, the "distinctions of good and evil," the "vengeance, gloating in the agony of sinners," and the melancholy and sternness which he found in the poem. Now, Whitman over-emphasized the unjoyous side of Dante—partly, it may be, because he had read only the *Inferno* when he wrote his comments. And he erroneously conceived Dante to be revengeful: he seems to have overlooked that the Italian poet displays a wonderful sense of justice and a heart full of tenderness. And he seems to have been ignorant, at least for several years after reading the Carlyle translation, even of the existence of the *Purgatorio.* Apparently he did not always read the *Inferno* closely and appreciatively. Furthermore, he could not understand Dante's position among the poets, or as the greatest literary artist of the Italians; but he frankly confessed that the fault doubtless lay with him, in his lack of knowledge. On the other hand, he showed, according to Mr. Thayer (and the testimony is corroborated by his notes on and references to the poem), a lively interest in Dante. Moreover, he did appreciate from the first the high quality of the *Inferno* as narrative: its "one simple trail of idea," the masterful selection shown in it, its brevity and condensation, its rapid movement, and the fascination it has as a well told tragedy. He admired the poem's vigor and ruggedness, the simplicity of its language, the precision with which it cuts to the heart of matters, and its pictorial quality. And, although he felt that Dante was not for our age and said that Dante's ideals were not his, he nevertheless stated that the Italian poet "is vital," "is unquestionably one of the first class men," "stands . . . for supreme ideals."

THE BEGINNINGS OF DARWINIAN ETHICS 1859–1871

By Kenneth Franklin Gantz

Ethical problems, as even the casual observer knows, were of signal importance in Victorian literature and thought, and no small part of that intense scrutiny of the moral being of man evident in the closing quarters of the nineteenth century proceeded from the evolutionary thought of the Victorian Renaissance. To not a few the importance of man's conduct in the vast scheme of things had become very questionable, and it is evident that with many the traditional morality had lost its authority. There issued a search for new motives and new sanctions for right conduct. One result, as is well known, was the derivation of an ethic and a theory of the origin and development of morality from the principle of natural selection, the survival of the fittest.

In his *The Descent of Man* (1871) Darwin devoted three chapters to outlining such a theory, and among his books this one was second only to *The Origin of Species* in arousing controversy, much of which centered around the proposition of a natural origin of man's moral being. *The Descent of Man,* as a result of its application of the idea of natural selection to the exposition of moral origins, has customarily been held to be a landmark in the history of ethics, and justly so; for to Darwin's name and to the interest in the long awaited pronouncement of the master on the bearing of his theory on the past of man—a topic which except for one sentence he had avoided in *The Origin of Species*—was due the fruitful debate over evolutionary ethics which followed its publication. It is, moreover, from *The Descent of Man* that many of the subsequent advocates of evolutionary ethics drew their inspiration.

But, as Darwin indicates in his text, *The Descent of Man* was not unanticipated by concepts of the evolution

of morality by natural selection; and in view of the importance of the history of contemporary ethics to the student of Victorian letters and thought, it seems worth while to examine in some detail the period intervening between *The Origin of Species* (1859), before which the concept of natural selection was generally unknown, and *The Descent of Man,* in order to ascertain what influence the idea of natural selection had upon ethical speculation before Darwin himself spoke on the subject. Such an examination reveals that earlier than *The Descent of Man,* usually held to be the origin of Darwinian ethics—that is, ethics based on the principle of natural selection—there had accumulated a large mass of material on the origin and development of morals by natural selection. But although Darwin has himself acknowledged his sources and certain later writers have noticed them,[1] this material has in the main been passed over in silence. Nor did Darwin by any means indicate the extent to which it was available, to anyone interested in such matters, in the books and the periodicals and the scientific journals of the 1860's. Before the appearance of *The Descent of Man,* however, Darwinian ethics was not presented formally; there were no systems built on it; moreover, despite the number of such topics broached, the typical discussion of morality contained no inkling of the evolutionary approach, and it remained for Darwin to assemble into a coherent and systematic account and to present to the attention of the world much of the data the 1860's had produced concerning the evolution of morals.

In general the ethical concepts of Darwinism developed chronologically through three phases. The first, which ends in 1863, was a period of general silence so far as any ethical implications of Darwinism are concerned, the few comments which were relevant being merely incidental.

---

[1]For example, Jacob Gould Schurman, *The Ethical Import of Darwinism* (New York, 1887); and James H. Tufts, "Darwin and Evolutionary Ethics," *The Psychological Review,* XVI (1909), 195–206.

The second period was inaugurated in 1863 by a new spirit in the study of anthropology: the investigation of the moral and intellectual characteristics of man was to be given more attention, and in this investigation the concept of natural selection became a frequent mark of reference. A third period may be discerned beginning in 1869 with the appearance in several places of the idea that natural selection alone or unaided was not sufficient to account for the evolution of man's moral and intellectual being. In view of the suggestive nature of the materials, I have thought it best to present them topically within chronological divisions so that this paper might afford not only a guide, for the 1860's, to the bibliography of the evolution of morality by natural selection but also some clue to the concepts advanced and their chronological development.[2]

I. Natural Selection in Ethics (1863–1868)[3]

Anthropology, a science closely connected in the 1860's with the study of the origins of morality, experienced a

---

[2]It must also be remembered that there were several bodies of material in the 1860's which, in the light of biological evolution, furnished a background for evolutionary ideas of the origin of morals. The utilitarian ethic was particularly appropriate, as natural selection is itself a principle of utility. The work of Max Müller on the history of language and on comparative mythology popularized theories that the Hebrew and Christian narratives, and even the terminology of morality, had emerged by evolution from non-moral significances and connotations. In 1861, Sir Henry Sumner Maine published an important and pioneering treatise on the history of jurisprudence which had evolutionary implications. Even before *The Origin of Species* Herbert Spencer had laid down an evolutionary hypothesis concerning the origin of morals which was based on biological evolution, although it lacked a *modus operandi.* Finally, the efforts to refute the "degradation" of man according to the Christian dogma of the Fall drew attention to the great influx of evidence as to the condition of primitive man and were a source of ideas about the evolutionary derivation of morals.

[3]The occasional and fragmentary statements of the first period, 1859–1862, bearing on the present question are included in the appropriate subdivisions of this period.

sudden development in that decade,[4] and Dr. James Hunt's inaugural address in 1863 before the newly-founded Anthropological Society of London may well be considered a manifesto of a new spirit in ethical as well as in anthropological studies. It laid down a program of investigation of the mental and moral characteristics of mankind, which had been neglected for the physical. Concerning the origin of man, Dr. Hunt declared that knowledge would be gained only by the inductive and deductive treatment of evidence, the folly of attempting to solve the problem by abstract logic having been demonstrated by the lack of results. In a new study of man he would reject anthropological evidence from uncorroborated historical materials, and he would dismiss the great mass of travel literature, then much relied upon, as worthless to science because of the lack of objectivity on the part of the observers, who were frequently influenced by some preconceived dogma. Indeed, he wished the Society to give up all dogmas, to confess ignorance of the laws regulating man's origin and development, and to be willing to begin *de novo*, basing opinions only upon actual demonstrable facts and arguing solely from the logical inferences from such data.[5]

Four months later there was another declaration for the "new spirit," which reached a wider audience. A reviewer in the *Saturday Review* called for a modern investigation of ethics and condemned the sterility of the speculations of the *a priori* moralist. Although he displayed no idea of natural selection as a key to ethical study, he wished to substitute for logical investigation an empirical one which was practically that adopted by the followers of Darwin in the sixties. He advocated the use of scientific terminology, observation of man in his real state, study of the morals of primitive man and of the instinct of animals, and abandonment of the dichotomy between physical and intellectual

---

[4] *Cf.* an address by Dr. James Hunt, President of the Anthropological Society of London, reported in "The Manchester Anthropological Society," *Anthropological Review*, V (1867), 15.

[5] James Hunt, "Introductory Address on the Study of Anthropology," *Anthropological Review*, I (1863), 1–20.

man.[6] By 1865 anthropological works were taking a prominent place in scientific literatures[7] and offering their readers important materials bearing on the evolution of morality.

In the only passage devoted to man in *The Origin of Species* Darwin had pointed the way to the application of the theory of natural selection to the evolution of the capacities of mind;[8] but the first person publicly to emphasize the relation of natural selection to morality, and the possibility of an evolution of morality by that means, was Thomas Henry Huxley, who stated, in 1862, that the moral faculty was capable of evolution by natural selection.[9] In 1864 Alfred R. Wallace, co-discoverer of natural selection, presented an important paper in which he attributed the arrest of the physical evolution of man to the development by natural selection of the mental and moral powers.[10] His thesis was that the Darwinian hypothesis is capable of explaining why there have been no physical changes in man in the lengthy period of record. Other animals, he said, are forced into bodily change by changes of environment, but once man had risen to the level of mental adaptability, he could combat such changes by the agency of mind. Henceforth the capacities which enabled man to devise weapons or new social combinations when the environment changed, were the capacities which needed to be strengthened and which, rather than his body, were modified by natural selection.

A year later John McLennan's *Primitive Marriage* (London, 1865) contributed to the recognition of the possibility

---

[6]"Whewell on Mackintosh," *Saturday Review*, XV (1863), 764.

[7]"Contemporary Literature," *Westminster Review*, LXXXIII (1865), 601.

[8]Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection* (2d ed. reprinted; New York, 1867), p. 424.

[9]Thomas Henry Huxley, "Six Lectures to Working Men 'On Our Knowledge of the Causes of the Phenomena of Organic Nature'" [1864, delivered 1862], *Collected Essays*, II (New York, 1893), 471.

[10]Alfred R. Wallace, "On the Origin of Human Races," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London, Anthropological Review*, II (1864), clviii–clxxxvii.

of an evolution of morals. McLennan used the concepts of evolution and the struggle for existence to explain certain phenomena in marriage ceremonies, social laws and customs forbidding the marriage of individuals of particular relationships to each other, types of marriage, and systems of kinship. In so doing he demonstrated the importance of two sources of inquiry for further study of the history of morality: the observation of primitive societies and the analysis of the symbolical existence of barbaric customs among civilized peoples. By these means he traced the evolution of the idea of marriage from promiscuity to Christian monogamy, and showed that the "morals" of modern marriage are tied by descent with the evolution of kinship and succession under the influence of conditions affecting the number of women available.

Another book which drew increased attention to the existence of evidence among present-day savages as to the condition of primitive man, was E. B. Tylor's *Researches into the Early History of Mankind* (London, 1865). Tylor himself, in a paper to the Royal Institution, defended the thesis that in the history of man's mental condition there is "an upward progress, a succession of higher intellectual processes and opinions to lower ones," and attributed to natural selection man's advance from his primeval low mental state. Of especial importance was his alignment with the new spirit of ethical investigation by his insistence upon the use of ethnological data in the study of man's primeval condition and the evolution of morals.[11]

Controversy in the public periodicals was also displaying to general attention the possibility of an evolution of morals. The publication in 1867 of a new edition of Buckle's *History of Civilization in England* aroused a debate over the immutability of moral truth. A writer in the *North British Review* held that, contrary to Buckle, there is a development of the great moral maxims, and to

---

[11]Edward B. Tylor, "On Traces of the Early Mental Condition of Man," *Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain*, V (1866–69), 83–93.

explain such a development he called upon "self-preservation" and natural selection working amid changing social circumstances.[12] John Morley, then editor of the *Fortnightly*, entered this controversy; but, though he agreed that moral maxims have evolved, he showed no direct Darwinian influence at this time.[13] Finally, Spencer's theory of the origin of consciousness in the reflex reactions of the lowest forms of life, and its development through the inheritance of habitual patterns of reflexes and their associations, was attracting notice. Impressions of Spencer's supposed utilitarianism in morality were becoming so current that he was led to express his views on the origin of the moral sentiments definitely and in popular form. He found the primary basis of morality in the order of nature and the origin of moral knowledge in experience with that order, the origin of the moral sentiments in sympathy, of sanctions in recognition of utility, of virtues in utility.[14]

Of immediate relevance to the question of an evolution of morals was the possibility of the existence of moral sentiment in the lower animals; and although it has been stated that before *The Descent of Man* there were no attempts to approach the moral problem exclusively from the data of natural history,[15] there were many in the 1860's who accepted the possibility as fact and assigned the origin of the moral sentiments of man to similar elements in his animal forbears.

From about 1839 Darwin had been convinced of the natural origin of emotion, upon which, of course, he assumed that moral sentiments depended.[16] In 1859 he

---

[12]"The Natural History of Morals," *North British Review*, XLVII (1867), 359–403.

[13]John Morley, "A Fragment on the Genesis of Morals," *Fortnightly Review*, IX (1868), 330–38.

[14]Herbert Spencer, "Morals and Moral Sentiments," *Fortnightly Review*, XV (1871), 419–32.

[15]Tufts, "Darwin and Evolutionary Ethics," *Psychological Review*, XVI, 201.

[16]Charles Darwin, "Autobiography," in Frances Darwin's *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (London, 1888), I, 95.

expressed a belief in the evolution of man's mental powers from a low origin by natural selection and denied the necessity of the intervention of creative power to account for man's advanced state of being.[17] At this same time it was his opinion that animals possess reason,[18] and a few years later, in 1868, he called attention to the variation in mental attributes of individuals of a species.[19]

In 1861 Huxley remarked on the psychical affinity of man and animal and on the presence of moral emotions in the latter, and implied the origin of man's higher mental and moral faculties in the lower ones of the animal.[20] A year later he attributed the higher development of those qualities to the power of speech, which enables man to transmit experience. Succeeding generations, therefore, have the advantage of accumulated knowledge. By his quality of speech alone, he decided, is man distinguished from the brute.[21]

Sir Charles Lyell, the third of the generation's three wise men in matters evolutionary, also found it impossible to draw a distinction in kind between the intellectual and moral faculties of animals and those of men. He believed that animals possess individuality, intelligence, and morals, and agreed with Huxley on the possibility of tracing man's faculties far back in the animate world.[22]

Thus the trend of thought with the leaders of science was decidedly towards belief in the presence of the rudiments of morals in the animals. The traditional concept of man's moral nature as a thing unparalleled in the creation, as the gift of God solely to man, was breaking down

---

[17]Darwin to Charles Lyell, Oct. 11, 1859, *ibid.*, II, 210–11.

[18]*Cf.* Darwin to Asa Gray, Nov. 26, 1860, *ibid.*, II, 354.

[19]Charles Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication* (2d ed. reprinted; New York, 1876), II, 404.

[20]Thomas Henry Huxley, "On the Zoological Relations of Man to the Lower Animals," *Natural History Review*, I (1861), 68.

[21]Huxley, "Six Lectures to Working Men," *Collected Essays*, II, 473–4.

[22]Sir Charles Lyell, *The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man with Remarks on the Origin of Species by Variation* (London, 1863), pp. 493–5.

in an age which, on the whole, stoutly defended the divine origin of man's moral being.

In 1864 two anonymous articles appeared, neither written by an evolutionist, which indicate that the idea of moral sentiments in animals was not confined to pioneering scientists or to radical circles. The first article denied a generic point of distinction between man and animals on any ground whatsoever. In any such qualities as might be compared, the difference would be found to be merely one of degree. Animals possess reasoning ability, a rudimentary language, the power of abstraction, anatomic structure like that of man, upright position, moral character, emotional expression, self-consciousness, perfectibility or "improvable reason," moral perceptions, memory and will, a sense of religion in that they fear the unknown, which is all that certain tribal religions resolve themselves into, a soul, by the definitions giving one to man, and immortality, by the same general arguments seeking to establish that of man. While the writer of this article admits that animals possess only the rudiments of these attributes, he asserts that some men also certainly possess them only in a very low degree. He does not, however, view these rudiments as one seeking evidence for their evolution into the higher faculties which distinguish man.[23]

The second article regarded the rudiments of morals among animals to be evidence not of evolution but of intuition. The author of this article argued that as there is hardly any moral virtue of which some animal does not show a trace, it is superficial to consider animal nature as a mere mass of violent, unregulated passion; and since animals cannot reason and since moral principles are dependent upon some sort of rationality, these traces of morality must be due to intuition.[24]

---

[23]"The Distinction between Man and Animals," *Anthropological Review*, II (1864), 153–63.

[24]"The Moral Relations of Men and Animals," *Saturday Review*, XVIII (1864), 145.

By 1865, Francis Galton, cousin of Darwin and pioneer of statistical psychology, was proclaiming moral and religious sentiments to be direct products of the herd instinct brought to its highest form by natural selection. He traced the origin of morality to affection among animals, upon which, in one or all of four forms—sexual, parental, filial, and social—he asserted the life of all except the lowest type of animals to depend. For an animal's well-being, disinterestedness, he said, is as essential as selfishness, because no animal lives entirely for itself, but must occasionally live for its mate, its parent, its offspring, or its fellow. Sympathy has its origin in natural selection working on the affections. By preserving those variations in the affections which are most suitable to given circumstances, natural selection culls out those which deviate too widely from the necessary standard. It might be expected, he concluded, to develop sympathy among men, even among the lowest barbarians, to a greater degree than among animals.[25]

In 1867 Wallace deduced from the imitation of animal by animal in protective coloring, the agency of which he believed to be natural selection, that animal faculties of perception and emotion must be of the same nature as those of man. This he considered to be "a fact of high philosophical importance in the study of our true relations to the lower animals."[26] When one considers Wallace's close adherence to the theory of natural selection at this time, it seems that the relation that was indicated between man and animal must have been one of descent. In another paper of the same year Wallace attacked the idea that birds build their nests by instinct, that is, in accord with innate ideas. He concluded "that the mental faculties exhibited by birds in the construction of their nests, are the same in kind as those manifested by mankind

---

[25]Francis Galton, "Hereditary Talent and Character," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XII (1865), 323–4.

[26]A. R. Wallace, "Mimicry, and Other Protective Resemblances among Animals," *Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection, a Series of Essays* (2d ed.; New York, 1871), pp. 127–8.

in the formation of their dwellings. These are, essentially, imitation, and a slow and partial adaption to new conditions."[27]

One obstacle to finding an origin for morality in unmoral mental activities such as those of animals or even first-evolved men was doubt as to the possibility of the development of the lower mental processes, like instinct, into intellect. In his *Principles of Psychology* (1855) Herbert Spencer had provided a hypothesis for such a development, and he repeated it in a *Fortnightly* article in which he also traced the rise of the moral sentiments from sub-human sources.[28] Although Spencer's hypothesis of the origin of moral sentiments did not directly embody the principle of natural selection, it was of especial importance; for, based on the concept of biological evolution, it brought the rationalistic utilitarian ethic into accord with Darwinism.

Attention was being called to certain differences among the races, classes, and types of men which had a bearing on the possibility of an evolution of morals. Not only are there physiological differences indicative of varying biological histories, but there are psychological and moral differences suggestive of variation in the development of moral being. If races present inherently peculiar moral reactions, if some peoples are entirely without them, and others, though civilized, are without those which might be thought implied in any system of morality natural to man, if even sections and types of the same populations do not seem by nature morally close akin,[29] it is reasonable to presume that man's moral being has originated and developed

---

[27]A. R. Wallace, "The Philosophy of Bird's Nests," *ibid.*, p. 229.

[28]Spencer, "Morals and Moral Sentiments," *Fortnightly Review*, XV, 419–32. *Cf. supra.* As Spenser's hypotheses concerning the evolution of mind and of moral sentiments are well known, attention is directed without discussion to their relevancy to the present topic.

[29]*Cf.* James Hunt, "Address Delivered at the Third Anniversary Meeting of the Anthropological Society of London," *Journal of the Anthropological Society, Anthropological Review*, IX (1866), lxxviii; John Lubbock, *Pre-historic Times* (London, 1865), pp. 355, 365; "The Descriptive Anthropology of Persia," *Anthropological Review*, VI (1868), 29; "The Early History of Man," *North British Review*,

by processes involving variation and consequent conditioning by diverse circumstances. No theory of multiple origin would be plausible if extended sufficiently to explain so much variation. Evidences such as these, regardless of the construction put upon them by those presenting them, must have been, to many, highly suggestive of an evolution of morals and also, variation being essential to natural selection, of Darwin's principle.

Likewise relevant to the possibility of an evolution of morality were the several pronouncements that most of the savage peoples were devoid of religion. As for an ethical religion, that was the last stage in a long development.[30] Concerning the "belief in God, and the idea of his hating sin and loving righteousness," the opinion was expressed that probably there was a time when no human thing had such a conception, that certainly there are living savage tribes who do not have it.[31] The Darwinian scientists were agreed that man's religion, which he had at one time been without, had come into being by natural and evolutionary processes.

It was the work of Francis Galton on the inheritance of intelligence that established the idea of the possibility of the hereditary transmission of man's moral being, and it is upon variations and improvements in that moral being and their inheritance in subsequent generations that an evolution of man's moral nature depends. In 1865 Galton published an important article which reveals his conviction that psychical qualities in man and the lower animals are hereditary and under the control of selective breeding. He believed that every special quality depends upon a variety of conditions, and he held that the entire character might be altered by the modification of any one

---

L (1869), 286–7; "Meeting of the British Association," *Quarterly Journal of Science*, VI (1869), 608; "Race in Religion," *Anthropological Review*, IV (1866), 289–320.

[30]*Cf.* John Lubbock, *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man* (American ed.; New York, 1871), pp. 114 ff.

[31]"The Early History of Man," *North British Review*, L (1869), 284–5.

of these conditions. He cites, as evidence of the hereditary nature of character traits, the distinctive character of entire races, such as the American Indian and the Negro. Even varieties within each race have their own peculiar character traits. Types of character, therefore, could be bred, and evil conduct can be attributed, at least in part, to the inheritance of undesirable qualities of character, such as a craving for drink or an inability to perceive utilitarian ends. Acquired virtuous habits cannot be inherited, but the tendency to acquire them can.[32] In his *Hereditary Genius* (1869), Galton continues along the line of his earlier article, although again his chief interest is the inheritance of intellectual qualities. Applying statistical methods to this problem, he points out that moral gifts follow the law of deviation from an average just as do physical characteritics.[33]

The evolution of morals was linked even more closely with biological evolution by speculations that the moral being of man, as a product of mental power, is merely a function of his physiological structure, which in turn is merely a combination of matter and the animation of which is a function of that matter. Good and bad conduct, theories of good and evil, ethical codes—all have their basis in changes, controlled by and responding to the laws of matter, within the material structure of the mind, because thought is merely a function of the brain stuff; and, moreover, brain itself is the product of an evolution traceable back through lower and lower forms until mind is found emerging from sensation, and back farther until sensation is found emerging from animated matter.

Spencer had laid down the principle of organic memory in his *Principles of Psychology* (1855). The predisposition to certain patterns of action and thought, such as

---

[32]Galton, "Hereditary Talent and Character," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XII, 157–66, 318–27.

[33]Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius: an Inquiry into its Laws and Consequences* (American ed.; New York, 1870), p. 282.

instincts, and the combination of impression into compound ideas of good and evil, he held to be the result of ages of experience impressing itself upon the organism by effecting changes in the nervous structure, which changes are transmissible through the generations.[34] Structure, then, is the ultimate basis of right and wrong.

In 1862, Huxley, in applying the principles of variation and natural selection to the development of the moral faculty, had declared that moral functions are the result of structures and of the molecular forces which they exert.[35] By the middle sixties there were current in prominent scientific meetings expressions of opinion as to the probability of a purely physical basis for all phenomena of life.[36] Assuming his frequent rôle of popularizer of the new ideas, Huxley made in 1868 an address in Edinburgh, on the physical basis of life. He explained that in animals and plants the structural unit of the living body is made up of the same material, protoplasm, and that vital action and even thought itself are ultimately based upon molecular changes in this life stuff.[37] Science was also pushing into the relation of thought and physiological conditions. Galton had an inkling of the influence that bodily states have on attitudes of mind: he saw a "frequent correlation between an unusually devout disposition and a weak constitution."[38]

Although the beliefs of the Darwinians concerning the nature of evil were not necessarily based upon the principle of natural selection, they were naturally in conformity with the theory of biological evolution. They may, therefore, be considered as such views as probably would underlie

---

[34]*Cf. Principles of Psychology* (1st ed.; 1855), pp. 394–412, cited in the *Westminster Review*, XC (1869), 510–1.

[35]Huxley, "Six Lectures to Working Men," *Collected Essays*, II, 471–2.

[36]*Cf.* James Hunt, "On the Doctrine of Continuity Applied to Anthropology," *Anthropological Review*, V (1867), 119–20.

[37]Thomas Henry Huxley, "On the Physical Basis of Life," *Collected Essays*, I (New York, 1893), 154.

[38]Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, pp. 263–7.

any attempt to base a system of ethics upon that principle. An ethical system conforming to the theory of biological evolution might very well look upon good and evil as inherent in the order of things; otherwise they could not exist. Conduct, then, must be judged in relation to that order.

To Huxley, evil was not the will of God but rather the result of natural phenomena, within and without man, and as such might be dealt with and to a certain extent ameliorated.[39] Evil is one of the results of the working of the laws of nature and, regardless of any theory of sin, is a part of the lot of all organisms. Inhabitants of a universe moved by inexorable law must feel its force. This, in their consciousness, they label evil. Nature, then, is the source of moral law as well as of scientific law, and the general propositions of morality, which result in happiness or misery as they are correctly or incorrectly applied, can be deduced from it and can be verified in the experience of life.[40] Darwin also thought of pain and suffering as "the inevitable result of the natural sequence of events, *i.e.*, general laws. . . ."[41] Spencer believed that "all evil results from the non-adaptation of constitution to conditions. . . ."[42] In such views of the source of evil can be seen emerging a theory of morals recognizing natural selection as the basis for the norm of human conduct.

The Darwinians' view of reward and punishment was derived from their conception of the source of good and evil. They discarded the Christian belief in other-world compensation for the belief that man must be governed by the "customs of matter" and that the penalty for devi-

---

[39]Thomas Henry Huxley, "A Liberal Education: and Where to Find It," [1868], *Collected Essays, III* (New York, 1893), 90–2.

[40]Thomas Henry Huxley, "On the Educational Value of the Natural History Sciences," [1854], *ibid.*, pp. 58–62.

[41]Darwin to Mrs. Boole, Dec. 14, 1866, *Life of Darwin*, III, 64.

[42]Quoted by Tufts, "Darwin and Evolutionary Ethics," *Psychological Review*, XVI (1909), 201.

ation from them is pain. Man must adapt himself to all his conditions of existence if he would avoid punishment.[43]

"Original sin" also had a natural explanation. During the middle sixties attacks upon the great central dogma of Christianity were numerous. In one of these Galton, arguing from natural selection, struck at the belief in the Atonement by proposing a psychological explanation for belief in a "fall." Man's sense of "original sin," he asserted, is a result of his rapid rise from a low state. In civilized man yet linger relics of the cave man. His recent advance has left him with many of the traits and instincts of barbarism, an inner complex of impulses, "weaknesses of the flesh," failures of intelligence, all of which thwart his conscious social sense, or conscience. Religious sentiment has developed more rapidly, at least among some members of the community, than savage traits have declined, and the sense of original sin is man's recognition of this anomaly in his character. The more recently any people have been in barbarism, the more they feel the disparity between their character and their moral vision. Natural selection, then, has not harmoniously developed man's traits, and the resulting conflict in his character has been summed up by him in his doctrine of original sin.[44]

The question of free will or necessity, which underlies that of the ultimate responsibility of man for his conduct, was considered insoluble by representative Darwinians, who consequently put it aside as an unfruitful subject for discussion. As an example, Huxley's attitude can be cited. Materialistic necessity, according to Huxley, involves a grave error; it is beyond philosophic inquiry. The other extreme in belief, spiritualism, is even worse, as it does not approach the facts of human experience. Man's ultimate responsibility for his conduct, which depends upon his being a free moral agent who can choose between two lines of action, is then set aside by Huxley,

---

[43]*Cf.*, for example, Huxley, "A Liberal Education," *Collected Essays*, III, 83–6.

[44]Galton, "Hereditary Talent and Character," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XII, 327. *Cf.* Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, p. 349.

who in the last issue cannot decide between free will and necessity. But remaining agnostic on that issue, he will move about only in the world of fact and law. There is what seems to man to be, for all practical purposes, cause and effect, and man seems to be able, also for all practical purposes, to bring to bear by his own volition some influence on that succession of events he labels cause and effect. It can be said, then, that so far as the immediate world is concerned Huxley held man to be a free moral agent whose conduct can be measured by natural law, which expresses the inevitable sequences that are noted among things, an agent whose rewards and punishments are meted out to him as the apparent result of his apparently free interference with those sequences.[45]

For two decades after the appearance of *The Origin of Species,* many believers in Darwinism were cheered by the thought that natural selection assured the inevitable progress of man. Not only had natural selection elevated him intellectually and morally to a high standard by culling out retarding individuals, but it would continue, perforce, to raise him to a higher one. This optimistic doctrine is appropriately termed by Professor Morris R. Cohen the "myth of evolution." There was nothing new about the idea of perfectibility, but the theory of biological evolution, which after Darwin's pronouncement of the principle of natural selection was able to provide a *modus operandi* for the perfection of man that seemed a part of the natural order, gave that doctrine scientific plausibility.

Even before 1859 Spencer had linked the idea of the progress of man with that of biological evolution. Although not writing from the standpoint of natural selection, he had declared that all evil is the result of non-adaptation of constitution and conditions, but that adaptation is constantly going on, that evil perpetually tends to disappear, and that the ultimate development of the ideal man is

---

[45]Huxley, "On the Physical Basis of Life," *Collected Essays,* I, 158–64.

therefore logically certain.[46] One of Wallace's conclusions in his important article of 1864 was that the power of natural selection must ever lead to man's more perfect adaptation and must, consequently, continue to improve his moral nature.[47] Sir John Lubbock and Sir Charles Lyell both believed that natural selection implied the inevitability of the mental and moral perfection of man.[48] Darwin, however, had said that he did not believe in a law of necessary development,[49] and there is no indication that Huxley, who was later prominent in the dispelling of the myth of evolution, ever subscribed to it. The implication of its truth, which many saw in the principle of natural selection, was nevertheless an important result of the impact of Darwinism on ethical thought in the sixties.

During the 1860's the idea of natural selection was applied to the problem of the origin and development of civilization and to its future. Walter Bagehot, writing for the *Fortnightly Review,* attributed the advance of man into the civilized state to the natural selection of improved relationships resulting from moral causes. He found that man, uplifted by moral improvements, themselves the product of natural selection and the influence of certain other factors, had come from an anarchic state to a political one and that by natural selection the better polities had suppressed the poorer ones. Civilization had advanced by the selection of variations, and will continue to advance, he thought, as variations are allowed to present themselves for natural selection.[50]

There were also opinions, derived from consideration of the interference of contemporary moral practices with

---

[46]*Cf.* Ernest Albee, *A History of English Utilitarianism* (London, 1902), p. 278.

[47]"On the Origin of Human Races," *Anthropological Review,* II, clxix.

[48]*Cf.* Lubbock, *Pre-historic Times,* pp. 491–2; Sir Charles Lyell, *Principles of Geology,* II (London, 1868), 488–9.

[49]*Cf.* Lyell, *Principles of Geology,* II, 488.

[50]Walter Bagehot, "Physics and Politics," *Fortnightly Review,* VIII (1867), 518–38; IX (1868), 452–71; XII (1869), 58–72.

natural selection, concerning the survival of civilization that were the antithesis of the optimistic myth of evolution. For convenience these speculations may be termed Nietzschean (although they anticipated the master of evolutionary ethics) since they implied a strict application of the principle of natural selection to the definition of good and evil which replaces the Christian moral precepts with such ones as: evil is weakness; good is that which fits for survival; virtue—in its accepted definition—is a source of degeneration.

Francis Galton was the first in the sixties to suggest the beneficial effect on civilization which would follow the application to man of the principle of selective breeding; he pointed out the deleterious results which had followed certain deliberate violations of this principle. Judicious marriages, he declared, were the only way to make progress toward the superman.[51]

Certain Darwinians entertained pessimistic views of the effect of modern humane practices and of the organization of society upon the race. An article, attributed by Darwin to W. R. Greg,[52] declared that contemporary civilization was bringing about the degeneration of its constituent population. Greg seems to approach a definition of evil as weakness, for, if natural selection is a "righteous" principle, then that which fits for survival must be good,[53] as his discussion implies throughout. The substitution of mental for physical evolution, which Wallace had described as checking physical changes in man, has culminated in a civilization which, according to Greg, has suspended, and in some cases reversed, the law of natural selection. Although natural selection yet continues to work among the races of men—where the abler, stronger, and

---

[51]Galton, "Hereditary Talent and Character," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XII, 163.

[52]Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (American ed.; New York, 1872), p. 161n.

[53]*Cf.* Ralph Barton Perry, *The Present Conflict of Ideals* (New York, 1918), pp. 130–1.

the more advanced races are still those favored in competition—among the individuals of a nation, and among the classes of a community, it has failed altogether, because the social, moral, and material complications of civilization have introduced elements which oppose it: artificial and conventional advantages have replaced natural ones as the ruling and deciding force in matters of survival and propagation.

For the interference with this law of natural selection, two great achievements of civilization are responsible, namely, respect for life and respect for property. Among animals and savages the weak in body and mind, the sick, and the deformed perish, but civilization keeps them alive to propagate their like. Security of property for transmission as well as for enjoyment gives the powers of wealth to thousands who themselves never could have acquired property by industry or courage or have defended it with strength or ingenuity. Instead of being pushed aside, they carry off the most desirable brides to be the mothers of a degenerating progeny. Not only the rich but also the class at the other extreme of the social scale are finding their physique and their morale impaired by the appropriation and concentration of property in the hands of the few. The classes of society which beget more than their proportional share of children are not the ones who should do so, if the larger benefit of society is to be considered. It is the very rich and the very poor who are likely to be preponderately the parents of the coming generation. Both marry as early as they please and have as many children as they please—the rich because it is within their power to provide for their offspring, the poor because they have no motive for abstinence. It is the middle classes, those who form the energetic, reliable, advancing element of the population, those who wish to rise and those who do not choose to descend in the social scale who abstain from or postpone marriage. Greg concludes that no laws imposed from above or from without can restore the correct operation of natural selection, as no modern people would endure the autocratic interference

and control which would be required. He finds left for hope only a spread of education and an increase in moral sensitivity.[54]

In Greg's article are implications of the Nietzschean ethic: the slave morality, which coddles the unfit, as *böse*, the qualities which fit for survival as good, the dangerous life as productive of good, and the doctrine of the superman, at least in the sense of an improved race, physically and morally.

In 1869, within a year of Greg's article, appeared four other articles devoted to similar views. One declared that by basing present legislation upon the Darwinian theory to encourage the survival and the more rapid accumulation of desirable characteristics, it would be possible to influence the character and prosperity of future generations.[55] A second pointed out that moral development granted power to the weak to survive the strong, a condition which must lead to the physical degeneration of the race.[56] A third observed that sympathy and modern medicine interfere with natural selection and as a remedy suggested that those with diseases refrain from reproduction.[57] A fourth deplored the deleterious effect of civilization on racial health.[58]

A clear anticipation of Nietzsche's "slave morality" appeared in Galton's article of February, 1871.[59] This slave morality, Galton asserted, is due to the fact that the gregarious instincts of man have been too well preserved

---

[54][W. R. Greg], "On the Failure of 'Natural Selection' in the Case of Man," *Fraser's Magazine*, LXXVIII (1868), 353–62.

[55]"On Darwinism and National Life," *Nature*, I (1869), 183–4.

[56]"Natural Selection among Mankind," *Saturday Review*, XXVII (1869), 274–5.

[57]"The Action of Natural Selection in Man," *Westminster Review*, XCIII (1870), 543–5.

[58]John Henry Bridges, "Influence of Civilization on Health," *Fortnightly Review*, XII (1869), 149–61.

[59]Francis Galton, "Gregariousness in Cattle and Men," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XXIII (1870–71), 353–7.

for the good of civilization. Galton himself summarized his article:

> I propose, in these pages, to discuss a curious and apparently anomalous group of base moral instincts and intellectual deficiencies, to trace their analogies in the world of brutes, and to examine the conditions through which they have been evolved. I speak of the slavish aptitudes, from which the leaders of men, and the heroes and the prophets, are exempt, but which are irrepressible elements in the disposition of average men. I refer to the natural tendency of the vast majority of our race to shrink from the responsibility of standing and acting alone, to their exaltation of the *vox populi*, even when they know it to be the utterance of a mob of nobodies, into the *vox Dei*, to their willing servitude to tradition, authority and custom. . . . I shall endeavor to prove that the slave aptitudes, whose expression in man I have faintly but sufficiently traced, are the direct consequence of his gregarious nature, which, itself, is a result both of his primaeval barbarism and of his subsequent forms of civilization. My argument will be, that gregarious animals possess a want of self-reliance in a marked degree; that the conditions in the lives of those animals have made gregarious instincts a necessity to them, and therefore, by the law of natural selection, those instincts and their accompanying slavish aptitudes have gradually become evolved. Then, I shall argue, that our remote ancestors have lived under parallel circumstances, and that we have inherited the gregarious instincts and slavish aptitudes which are developed under those circumstances, although, in our more advanced civilization, they are of more harm than good to our race.

II. Natural Selection Plus X in Ethics (1869–1871)

The year of 1869 marks a definite change of opinion on the part of several prominent Darwinians as to the extent of the agency of natural selection in the evolution of man, particularly in respect to his mental and moral faculties. Evolutionary phenomena inexplicable by natural selection alone were increasingly being noted, and various explanations adducing some unknown began to be advanced to account for them: (1) that natural selection must have been supplemented by the *saltus*, or sudden leap over intervening gradations in the course of evolution, (2) that it must have been directed by a "higher intelligence," or (3) that it must have been complemented by some natural force or forces yet unconceived.

Several years before 1869, Sir Charles Lyell had discerned the phenomenon of the *saltus*, rather by speculation than by close observation. He asserted that the theory of evolution by a series of infinitely small gradations did not explain the appearance of genius in a mediocre family. Likewise, as lone individuals have wrought important revolutions in the moral and intellectual worlds, it might be possible to explain the superiority of certain races of mankind as the result of such sudden advances in individuals. When it is reflected that mental qualities are transmissible by inheritance, it is possible, perhaps, to attribute to such *salti* the introduction of higher and higher forms and grades of intellect, so that at a remoter period there may have been cleared at one bound the space which separated the most elevated stage of the unprogressive mental powers of the inferior animals from the first and lowest form of the progressive reason of man. Such leaps are interruptions of the ordinary course of nature, and to account for them Lyell believed that variation and natural selection must be secondary to a higher, incomprehensible law of development, which has produced the moral and intellectual faculties by directing natural selection to the results of new and added causes inherent in the working of that higher law.[60]

Francis Galton also discerned the infeasibility of explaining all evolutionary phenomena by a series of minute gradations of degree, but he did not wish to add to natural selection any other principle, only to extend it to include a culmination of variations accumulating and occasionally occurring simultaneously, so that the result appeared to be a *saltus*. He proposed the theory that there is a tendency in organisms to resist change in type, to overcome which required such unusual pressure toward variation that the yielding to pressure resulted in a *saltus*, an overthrowing of the stability of types. Galton fully agreed with Darwin that all forms of organic life are in some sense convertible into one another, as all have sprung from

[60]Lyell, *Antiquity of Man*, pp. 489, 504–5.

a common ancestry; but he felt that the phenomena of conversion, or descent, could not all be termed insensible gradations, nor could there have been the tremendous number of intermediate links between types required by Darwin. Galton proposed that the organic world consists of entities, each of which might be compared to a spheroid with many facets on its surface, upon one of which it reposes in stable equilibrium. If, by the accumulated action of incident forces, this equilibrium is disturbed, the spheroid may be supposed to roll until it settles once more in stable equilibrium on another facet. Thus he enlarged the scope of the Darwinian principle to include with insensible gradation the selection of changes in type caused by an occasional kaleidoscopic shift within the organism.[61]

Sometime between 1867 and 1869 Wallace relinquished his opinion that natural law alone could account for all the qualities of man; in particular, it could not account for his moral being. As late as 1867, he had been solidly advocating the Darwinian principle;[62] but at the meeting of the British Association, in 1869, while admitting that the evidence is overwhelming for man's steady advance in knowledge and intellect, he expressed his doubt that man had made any equal advance in moral feeling. Savages, he said, possess a moral sense which influences them just as much as civilized people are influenced by their moral sense.[63] Furthermore, even the extreme probability of man's descent from the animal cannot constitute evidence that man's intellectual powers and his moral nature were wholly developed by the same process that had produced his physical body.

In a review published in 1869 Wallace pointed out that anyone acquainted merely with the productions of unaided

---

[61]Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, p. 369.

[62]*Cf.* "Creation by Law," *Quarterly Journal of Science*, IV (1867), 471–88; "Meeting of the British Association," *ibid.*, pp. 589–90; and A. R. Wallace, "On Natural Selection Applied to Anthropology," *Anthropological Review*, V (1867), 103–5.

[63]Reported in "Meeting of the British Association," *Quarterly Journal of Science*, VI (1869), 609.

nature might reasonably doubt the possibility of producing such a creature as a dray-horse, for example, by the power of man directing the actions of the laws of variation for his own purpose. We know, however, that the dray-horse has been developed, and we also know that the laws of evolution alone would never have produced him, for there is no necessity in nature for such a creature. "We must therefore admit the possibility, that in the development of the human race, a Higher Intelligence has guided the same laws for nobler ends." The presence in low races of mental equipment beyond their needs seems to preclude the possibility of its being evoked by natural selection alone, which must respond to necessity.[64]

In 1870 Wallace repeated and elaborated this argument.[65] The utilitarian hypothesis, which he characterizes as the theory of natural selection applied to the mind, Wallace does not believe adequate to account for the development of the moral sense. At first sight, he says, it would seem that such feelings as those of abstract justice and benevolence could never have been acquired by the preservation of useful variations, because they are incompatible with the law of the strongest, which is the essence of natural selection; however, if we consider not individuals but societies, justice and benevolence exercised within the tribe would strengthen the tribe. On the other hand, certain human faculties, such as the power to form ideal conceptions of space and time and the capacity for artistic feelings, are not so accountable, as they could have been of no possible use to man in his early stages of development or civilization. Nor can we so account for the development of the moral sense or conscience in savage man; for although the practice of benevolence or honesty or truth may have been useful to a tribe, such practice

---

[64][A. R. Wallace], "Sir Charles Lyell on Geological Climates and the Origin of Species," *Quarterly Review*, CXXVI (1869), 381, 391–4. The authorship of this article is established by Darwin. *Cf. Life of Darwin*, III, 116.

[65]A. R. Wallace, "The Limits of Natural Selection as Applied to Man," *Contributions to Natural Selection*, pp. 351–6.

does not account for the feeling of sanctity attached to actions which each tribe considers right and moral, a feeling very different from that which they attach to the merely useful.

Wallace turns to the intuitional theory of a moral sense for a solution of the problem. In man's nature, he continues, there is a feeling of right and wrong, antecedent to and independent of experiences of utility. Where the relations between men are unrestricted, this feeling attaches itself to those acts of universal utility or self-sacrifice which are instigated by man's affections and sympathies and which he calls moral. Otherwise, it may be, and often is, perverted to give sanction to acts of narrow and conventional utility which are really immoral. Here Wallace separates an abstract sense, a mystical feeling for right and wrong, from all content of concrete action. This sense, as he interprets it, does not reveal what is right, but envelopes in a mystic sanction conduct which other criteria reveal as right. He talks of a natural appetite for right actions, even though this appetite is not capable of infallibly discerning right from wrong actions. It is this moral feeling which natural selection alone could not have developed in man and toward which a higher intelligence or law, utilizing the principle of selection, must have guided the evolution of man.

St. George Mivart, friend and pupil of Huxley, felt in 1868 certain difficulties as to the theory of natural selection—that the Darwinian system could not account for the origin of the human intellect or, above all, its moral intuitions. In 1869 he told Huxley that he must enter this subject controversially,[66] and the result was his *Genesis of Species* (1871). His object was to affirm his belief that natural selection operates but that it requires to be supplemented by the action of some natural law or laws yet undiscovered.[67] To it he adds another evolutionary

[66]St. George Mivart, "Some Reminiscences of Thomas Henry Huxley," *Nineteenth Century*, XLII (1897), 994–5.

[67]St. George Mivart, *On the Genesis of Species* (2d ed.; London, 1871), p. 5.

process, neither excessively minute nor fortuitous in its action, namely, specific genesis of types as the result of the presence in organisms of innate forces directed by some unknown teleological principle.[68]

Mineral species, Mivart says, must possess an internal power or force by which their crystals "not only assume their external symmetry, but even repair it when injured." Chemical elements also possess innate powers to form certain unions. Likewise, in the organic world there is, according to the authority of Herbert Spencer, an innate tendency in physiological units to assume the parent form from which they spring. If, then, innate powers must be attributed to mineral species, to chemical atoms, and to physiological units, it is only reasonable to attribute these powers to individual organisms. The conception of such internal and latent capabilities and their use by external power, Mivart continues, may be illustrated by one of Galton's spheroids with its many facets. The innate tendency of an organism to certain considerable and definite changes would correspond to the facets on the surface of the spheroid. As for the force that upsets the equilibrium of the spheroid, it is quite conceivable that the simultaneous action upon it of all known forces may result in changes which are harmonious and symmetrical.

For physical theories, Mivart concludes, there are but two alternatives: they must rest ultimately on the conception of innate power or on one of will force. Even the explanation of the celestial movements ends in the conception that every particle of matter has the innate power of attracting every other particle directly as the mass and inversely as the square of the distance. If one does not accept the view that volition is the only force and that all phenomena whatsoever are the immediate results of the action of intelligent and self-conscious will, he is logically driven to the conception of innate powers. Of these alternatives Mivart prefers the latter, for sudden changes—saltatory actions in nature—must be conceived

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 260–5.

as orderly and according to law, because the whole cosmos is so. Any such quality in man as moral intuition must, according to Mivart's theory, be the result of a *saltus* in the evolution of man in response to the innate tendency to change under the pressure of a teleological force.

III. Conclusions, with Reference to *The Descent of Man*

It has been shown that, in the period between *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man,* the idea of natural selection was applied to, or itself influenced, many phases of ethical inquiry. By providing a *modus operandi* it made plausible the evolution of the moral sentiments and of morality, even from the traits of the lower animals. It gave a semblance of scientific foundation to the hope for the perfectibility of man, and at the same time it aroused fear that civilization would degenerate because of its failure to operate under the influence of extreme group morality. It was associated with the establishment of the hereditary nature of moral qualities, with agnostic speculations about responsibility, and with naturalistic explanations of evil. Finally, its strict application to conduct suggested a new code of moral precepts based upon itself. During the closing years of the period, however, there was the expression of belief on the part of some that natural selection alone was insufficient to account for man's moral development, that it needed the aid of other forces.

In view of the disclosure of abundant material from 1859 to 1871 pertaining to the evolution of morals by natural selection, Darwin's *The Descent of Man* must be taken as inaugurating a second rather than the first phase in the history of Darwinian ethics. Although its publication elicited a great increase of attention to the possibility that man's moral nature and his morality were the result of an evolution, and a sharp controversy followed, repeating only in lesser degree and with shorter duration that which succeeded *The Origin of Species,* yet the rudiments of the controversy had been disclosed in the preceding decade.

On the other hand, the period between Darwin's two important books had seen, as a rule, only isolated debate over the fragments of the theory of moral evolution by natural selection, but, after *The Descent of Man* had assembled those fragments, the entire question came into the arena of conflict. *The Descent of Man,* then, inaugurated the controversial stage in the development of evolutionary ethics.

Darwin devotes three chapters of *The Descent of Man* to the evolution of moral being. In the first of these—chapter two—we find brought out in the comparison of the mental powers of the animals with those of man that these powers differ in degree but not in kind. This general idea and its more important details had been discussed before the appearance of *The Descent of Man,* as Darwin acknowledges. In the next chapter, Darwin discusses the moral sense, and likewise, in finding its origin in the social instincts, he was not proposing a new idea. But in the fullness with which he worked out his conception, and in some of his details, notably that of the genesis of the idea of "ought" in the conflict of instinctive impulses and the subsequent reflection of an intelligent agent, he was original. His more significant omissions of concepts which were available to him from the work of the sixties, particularly those of the origin of the social instincts and the ultimate source of morality in the principles of organization of organisms, were perhaps due to his caution in view of the lack of definite evidence. In the last of his three chapters—chapter five—Darwin brings together most of the ideas of the previous decade about the evolution of man's moral nature. He draws on Wallace, McLennan, Tylor, Galton, Bagehot, Greg, and Lubbock, to name only his more important sources. He does not include the factor of imitation, nor does he more than glance at the effect of the development of an ethical religion as an element in the evolution of morality. He does strongly insist on the power of habit as a co-factor of natural selection in the progress of man's moral and intellectual faculties. This is his most original contribution, and is probably the result

of a feeling that natural selection alone is not sufficient to account for the development of such qualities.

What has just been said of Darwin's chapter five may be repeated for his entire discussion of the moral faculty of man: it is a résumé of the ideas of the previous decade developed on that subject from the point of view of the evolution of man. Darwin's real contribution consisted in gathering together the more significant and less problematical of those ideas and in shaping them into a consistent and coherent theory of the origin, nature, and development of the moral being of man. To this theory he contributed two important details: (1) the genesis of "ought" in the conflict of instinctive impulses, and the subsequent reflection of an intelligent creature upon his resulting conduct; (2) habit as a co-factor of importance to natural selection. So explicit a presentation of the theory of the evolution of moral being as Darwin provided could not fail, especially when it was coupled with his name, to attract attention and controversy, although the same ideas had gone largely unnoticed in their scattered presentation during the 1860's.

EDWARD EGGLESTON'S RELIGIOUS TRANSIT

By Edward Stone

The literary reputation of Edward Eggleston has undergone a noticeable eclipse since the turn of the century. *The Hoosier Schoolmaster* gained him a short, if intense, fame as the first important literary chronicler of the Middle West. He successfully extended this popularity with five other novels of the region, but later he deserted fiction for historical research. If biographical attention is to be taken as a measuring rod, one must admit that, in comparison with Twain, Howells, Garland, and James, Eggleston, is of but secondary importance.

What no investigator has yet traced is the puzzling deterioration of Eggleston's religious faith. Bred in a region and time dominated by the fervor of Methodism, Eggleston embraced that creed, spread its doctrines in two states, left it temporarily, later turned to non-sectarianism, and at the age of forty-one left the church forever—a humble, admitted agnostic. The story of this strange religious transit is apparent in the pages of Eggleston's life and writings.

Born in southern Indiana in December, 1837, Eggleston began his active affiliation with religion when he was nineteen.[1] In 1856–1857 he was a circuit-rider in his home region for a period of several months, which ended with physical breakdown precipitated, probably, by the malarial conditions of the region.

In 1857 he left for Minnesota, where previously a short stay had improved his health. This time he stayed nine years, serving first as Bible agent, then as pastor of small congregations. His record was so remarkable that by 1859, at the age of twenty-one, Eggleston was already

---

[1]Except where otherwise indicated, biographical details are from Dr. R. L. Rusk's article in the *Dictionary of American Biography.*

pastor of one of the largest Methodist churches in Minnesota.[2]

In 1866 Eggleston gave up his pastorate to enter journalism. He moved to Chicago and became a contributor to leading juvenile periodicals. Nevertheless, his religious devotion seems not to have been impaired, for during the Chicago years he was active in Sunday-school work, undoubtedly deriving much pleasure from his association with children, who formed—and still form—his greatest audience.

When, in 1871, Eggleston—now in New York—published *The Hoosier Schoolmaster,* he not only revealed a region almost unknown, but also indicated the vigorous outlines of his own faith. Although the subject of religion is given greater importance in later novels, it is nowhere discussed more frankly than in this first book. True, it is the sulphur-and-brimstone preaching that causes the culprit to reveal the innocence of the hero, Ralph Hartsook; but it is faith in God that changes the bully, Bud Means, into a useful citizen. Perhaps the best expression of the frontier religious creed that Eggleston espoused at this period is evident in Ralph's conversation with Bud as the two set up the spiritual foundations of the "Church of The Best Licks":

> [*Bud:*] "Do you think he'd help a feller? Seems to me it would be number one to have God help you. Not to help you fight the other folks, but to help you when it comes to fighting the devil inside. But you see I don't belong to no church."
>
> [*Ralph:*] "Well, let's you and me have one right off. Two people that help one another serve to make a church."[3]

The Mystery of Metropolisville (1871), Eggleston's only fictional recording of his Minnesota experiences, attacks the vicious land-grabbing of the speculators who have invaded the new region. Eggleston vents his displeasure at this

---

[2]J. T. Flanagan, "The Hoosier Schoolmaster in Minnesota," *Minnesota History,* XVIII, 352 (Dec., 1937).

[3]*The Hoosier Schoolmaster* (New York, 1891), p. 125.

Mammon-worship and offers true faith as the only salvation for mankind. This he evinces in his treatment of Albert Charlton, a young skeptic. Concerning ministers, Albert tells his shocked mother that "not more than one in twenty of them is brave enough to tell truth."[4] He asserts:

> I don't believe that God cares. Everything goes by the almanac and natural law. The sun sets when the time comes, no matter who is belated.[5]

Later, however, when Albert faces imprisonment, such heretical avowals afford him no solace, and he begins reading the Bible:

> . . . he read the story of the trial and condemnation of Jesus. . . . Albert saw the profound essential unity of the narratives, he felt the inspiration of the sublimest character in human history. . . . Charlton, unbeliever that he was, wet the pages with tears, tears of sympathy with the high self-sacrifice of Jesus, and tears of penitence for his own moral weakness, which stood rebuked before the great Example.[6]

Finally, when he is imprisoned, talks with the chaplain begin to weaken his skepticism, and his spiritual regeneration is apparent in his confession:

> "I . . . am coming to believe in a Providence! . . . I have been a high-church skeptic. . . . But I have learned some things. I am yet unsettled in my opinions about Christ. . . . But I believe *in* him with all my heart."[7]

In *The End of the World* (1872), Eggleston writes with a similarly sincere faith. The action centers about the Millerite end-of-the-world scare of 1843. The story is essentially humorous, but belief in the divinity of Jesus is the vitalizing element. Eggleston is amused at the strait-laced Cynthy Ann and Brother Goshorn, and attacks the petty basis of Millerism, which he considers a sort of

---

[4] *The Mystery of Metropolisville* (New York, 1885), p. 43.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 244.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

Mormonism. Throughout he speaks for putting into practice the teachings of Jesus and the acceptance of God's love. Thus, when August Wehle is forced to run away, his mother and sister kneel in prayer for his safety:

> Perhaps there is no God. Or perhaps He is so great that our praying has no effect. Perhaps this strong crying of our hearts to him in our extremity is no witness of his readiness to hear. Let him live in doubt who can. Let me believe that the tender mother-heart and the loving sister-heart in that little cabin *did* reach up to the great Heart that is over us all in Fatherly love, did find a real comfort for themselves, and did bring a strength-giving and sanctifying something upon the head of the young man, who straightway rose up refreshed and departed out into the night . . . carrying with him thoughts and memories and—who shall doubt?—a genuine heavenly inspiration.[8]

Similarly, he writes that

> The sublimest self-sacrifice is only possible to a man by the aid of some strong moral tonic. God's love is the chief support of the strongest spirits.[9]

But the most eloquent of Eggleston's praise of the Bible is contained in Julia's reaction to the Gospel by Matthew. The author states that the words

> melted into her mood so that she seemed to know Christ and God for the first time. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden," she read and stopped. That means me, she thought with a heart ready to burst. And that saying is the gateway of life. . . . Julia read on, "And I will give you rest." And so she drank in the passage, clause by clause, until she came to the end about an easy yoke and a light burden, and then God seemed to her so different. . . . The old feeling was gone. She was no more a rebel nor an orphan. The presence of God was . . . a benediction. She had found rest for her soul, and He gave his beloved sleep.[10]

Concerning Eggleston's own religious outlook about this time, his brother writes:

> He still retained his membership in the Minnesota conference, partly from a feeling of good fellowship and partly because he felt a keen

---

[8] *The End of the World* (New York, 1872), p. 132.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 84.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

sympathy with the preachers out there in the good work they were doing for morality and the amelioration of life. But he had become so unorthodox in his belief that one of them threatened him about this time with a heresy prosecution because he wrote in one of his novels that it is only a theological quibble which denies to marriage an equal rank with baptism and the eucharist as a sacrament.[11]

Another commentator's estimate of Eggleston's faith is less alarming:

In some particulars his opinions have changed since he rode that first circuit in Indiana, but he has never unlearned his regard for the faithful men who hold forth the word of life to the dwellers of the border.[12]

From these remarks one gathers that Eggleston's religious views had already begun to change. Yet there is no heresy apparent in *The Circuit Rider* (1874). This book is a tribute to the fervor of the circuit-riders, and to the success of their efforts. It is they who convert the tormented Kike, the slipping Goodwin, and the haughty Patty, and who inject into the meagre frontier existence a faith bordering on ecstasy. In short, *The Circuit Rider* is as enthusiastic a depiction of the charm of Methodism as can be found. Eggleston's own estimation of his attempt is revealing:

Up to this point I have walked by faith; I could not see how the present generation could be made to comprehend the earnestness of their grand-fathers. But I have hoped that, none the less, they might dimly perceive the possibility of a religious fervor that was as a fire in the bones.[13]

The question naturally follows—was Eggleston recording publicly his unshaken devotion, or in effect penning a moving obituary of that faith? Further study leads one to the latter conclusion.

---

[11]G. C. Eggleston, *The First of the Hoosiers* (Philadelphia, 1903), pp. 338–339. Cf. *The End of the World*, p. 269, for passage referred to.

[12]W. Gladden, "Edward Eggleston," *Scribner's Monthly*, VI, 562 (Sept., 1873).

[13]*The Circuit Rider* (New York, 1931), p. 229.

Owing to the financial returns from his books, Eggleston had been able to devote himself entirely to writing. After *The Circuit Rider,* however, his interests were more diversified. Of the years 1874–1878, George Eggleston writes:

> During that time he brought out no book except a little volume of juvenile stories. He was writing a good deal for the magazines, however . . . He was also compiling and editing two sumptuously published subscription books, the one called "Christ in Art," and the other, "Christ in Literature."[14]

His name had been dropped from the rolls of the Methodist Conference of Minnesota,[15] but he was not inactive in religious matters. In the autumn of 1874, when he was asked to take charge of the Lee Avenue Congregational Church in Brooklyn, he accepted with terms that are indicative of his new attitude. He insisted that

> he could not meet the requirements of any orthodox council, nor would he on any account take charge of a church which imposed any creed upon its members or exacted any profession of faith at their hands.[16]

The church's attendance grew rapidly. Eggleston waged no doctrinal wars, had no care for creeds, and pleaded only for liberality. He had the largest Sunday-school in Brooklyn and built a library in the church. In addition, he organized a society of young men for discussion of subjects of practical human interest, such as tariff, trade unionism, and the relation of capital and labor.

During the five years of his new pastorate Eggleston published but one book, *Roxy* (1878). No book he ever wrote is a better commentary on Eggleston's inner thoughts. Gone are the patient humor and gentle remonstrance with which he treated the formalistic aspects of religion in the earlier novels. When Mark Bonamy, the erstwhile zealous minister, is called before the local church for having dared

---

[14]*The First of the Hoosiers,* pp. 348–349. Also, all other information concerning Eggleston's Brooklyn pastorate is from this book.

[15]Flanagan, *op. cit.,* p. 366.

[16]*The First of the Hoosiers,* p. 351.

to attend a circus, Eggleston's anger is startling and unparalleled in its vindictiveness:

A man might in that time be a miser, he might be dishonest in a mild way, he might be censorious and a backbiter from a pious standpoint, he might put the biggest apples on the top of the barrel or the little potatoes in the bottom of the bag, and the church could not reach him. But let him once see a man ride on two bare-back horses and jump through a hoop: That was a tangible apostasy, sure to bring ecclesiastical penalties.

Brave old ironside fathers: Blessings on you for chopping Charles Stuart's head off, and planting Plymouth Rock: You freed us from the Middle Ages; for which thanks. But you straightway bound upon us your own severe prejudices, and they have come down to us by all hands. The most dominant influence in this English-speaking world of ours today, is not that of Shakespeare, but of the brave cobblers and tinkers, whom the seventeenth century stuck in the stocks and prison-houses, and the fervent Wesleyan village blacksmiths and Yorkshire farmers of the eighteenth century are yet masters of the nineteenth. To this day we take our most innocent amusements in a guilty and apologetic fashion, bowing to the venerable prejudice, and saying: "By your leave, sir!"[17]

Yet here Eggleston was plainly caviling at the letter of the religious law—not the spirit—for at the end of the story the once irreproachably pious Roxy Bonamy takes her place in church and for the first time hears the sermon's true message:

Every word dropped like a benediction into her heart. She bowed her head upon the back of the seat in front of her and wept . . . And of all who knelt . . . in that old church that day to eat and drink the bread and wine, there were none who took the secret sacrament as did the woman who had dared to give her heart for others, after the pattern of the Master of self-sacrifice.[18]

Yet the author's unprecedented loss of restraint seems prophetic; a year later Eggleston gave up the ministry forever and left immediately for Europe. Concerning his departure George Eggleston writes:

. . . before going he told me what I had already guessed, namely, that the strain which had done more than all else to bring on his

[17] *Roxy* (New York, 1878), pp. 250–251.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 431–432.

collapse was not that of ceaseless work, but that of a mind ill at ease.[19]

Eggleston's own confession his brother paraphrases in the following manner:

"How can I go on preaching, . . . to profess what I no longer believe? For the last year I have had to study carefully every word I have spoken from the pulpit, lest I use terms that might imply a faith which I have not, and thus, while preaching morality, be guilty of an immorality on my own account. . . . I have wanted to go on with this work, because of the great good it is doing to others. . . . My only hope is that some one may be found who can carry it on . . . without having to compromise with his conscience, as I should have to do with mine."[20]

The break thus long postponed had come. Eggleston gives a public admission of his attitude at this period when he writes that

the true way is to "look upward and not downward, forward and not backward." À Kempis may rest where he is: I would rather walk in wide fields with Charles Darwin.[21]

His last two novels bear out this disillusioned outlook. In *The Graysons* (1887) the familiar religious digressions are absent. Speaking of Illinois customs before the Civil War, Eggleston mentions "athletic feats, practical jokes, and tales as rude as the most unblushing of those told by pious pilgrims to Caterbury in the old religious time,"[22] and philosophizes:

Is it not a rather poor fist of a world after all, this in which we live, where the most critical and irrevocable decisions must be made while the unexperienced youth is tossed with gusts of passion and blinded by traditional prejudices or captivated by specious theories? . . . The old allegorists painted the young man as playing chess with the devil; but chess is a game of skill. What the young man plays

---

[19]*The First of the Hoosiers*, p. 355.

[20]*Ibid.*, pp. 356–357.

[21]"Books That Have Influenced Me," *Forum*, III, 585–586 (Aug., 1887).

[22]*Century Magazine*, XXXV, 563 (Feb., 1888).

is often a child's game of pitch and toss, cross or pile, heads or tails, for stakes of fearful magnitude.[23]

This bewildered acknowledgment of the futility of human life he voices again in his last novel, *The Faith Doctor* (1891):

What a haphazard world is this! Draw me no Fates with solemn faces, holding distaffs and deadly snipping shears. The Fates? Mere children pitching heads and tails upon the paving-stones![24]

or,

Let us not be of the class unbearable who are ever trying to dissipate those lovely illusions that keep alive human complacency and make life endurable.[25]

finally:

How many dogmas have lived for centuries, not by their reasonableness but by the impressiveness of trappings! Creeds recited under lofty arches, liturgies chanted by generation following generation, . . . —these all take considerable advantage from the power of accessories to impose upon the human imagination. The divinity that hedges kings is the result of a set of stage-fixings which make the little great, and half the horror inspired by the priest's curse is derived from the bell and book and candle.[26]

The spiritual Eggleston was dead; only the critical scholar remained. The last twenty years of his life he spent in accumulating material for a vast *History of Life in The United States,* of which he published two volumes. This, at least, one might do honestly.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 374 (Jan., 1888). Huxley refers to this painting by Retzsch in his "A Liberal Education; and Where to Find It."

[24] *Ibid.*, XLI, 938 (Apr., 1891).

[25] *Ibid.*, XLII, 50 (May, 1891).

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

THE FIRST EDITION OF E. A. ROBINSON'S *THE PETERBOROUGH IDEA*

By Leonidas Warren Payne, Jr.

It is well known that Edwin Arlington Robinson spent the last twenty-five summers of his life in residence at what is generally known as the "Peterborough Colony" of creative artists founded by Edward MacDowell on a tract of wooded land near Peterborough, New Hampshire. Moreover, it is generally known that American literature is indebted to Robinson's residence at the Colony for practically the entire output of his creative imagination during the quarter of a century from 1911 to his death in 1935. It was Hermann Hagedorn who suggested to Robinson that the Peterborough Colony was the place for him if he wanted to get his creative work into concrete form. Robinson resisted the idea of joining any "colony" of artists, but he finally agreed to make an experimental visit to Peterborough in the summer of 1911. So doubtful was he of the outcome of the experiment that he had provided himself with a spurious telegram which he might produce as an excuse for a speedy departure at any time that he found the situation no longer tolerable. In spite of his misgivings and gloomy forebodings, Robinson liked the seclusion, the comforts, and the entire surroundings of the Colony, and, finding that he could work better there than anywhere else, he stayed. It has been declared that all of the poet's later works, from *The Man Against the Sky* (1916) to *King Jasper* (1935), had their beginning or their completion, or were entirely composed and finally polished off at the Colony. It was but natural, then, that Robinson should feel a desire to do what he could for the enlargement and the future support of the Colony, and so in 1916 he wrote and published in the *North American Review* of September of that year his well-known essay, "The Peterborough Idea."

Mrs. MacDowell and her advisers decided to have the essay reprinted immediately in pamphlet form for distribution among the friends of the Colony everywhere. This reprint was made directly from the magazine article with certain revisions and enlargements made by the poet himself to suit the needs of pamphlet circulation by the MacDowell Memorial Association, but, as Mrs. MacDowell herself says, Robinson had nothing to do with the practical details of publication. Later other printings of the pamphlet were called for, and up to the present perhaps a half dozen or more editions of it have been distributed. Apparently no detailed records of the various printings were kept, however, and naturally the sequence of the various editions later became one of the most neglected of all the Robinson bibliographical problems.

It may be well first of all to give a brief account of the published statements concerning the essay as they were set down by the several bibliographers. The first bibliography of Robinson's work was prepared by Major W. van R. Whitall and published as a supplement to Lloyd Morris's book, *The Poetry of Edwin Arlington Robinson*, New York, 1923. Major Whitall records the essay on page 98 as follows:

THE PETERBOROUGH IDEA
1916

THE "NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW" for September 1916 contains the following: "THE PETERBOROUGH IDEA / By Edwin Arlington Robinson"/ AND REPRINTED BY PERMISSION, FROM THE "NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW" in pamphlet, size 7x6, on white paper bearing the water mark "Alexandra," by the MacDowell Memorial Association, Peterborough, N. H., 1917.

Evidently Major Whitall did not mean to say in this notice that the pamphlet was actually printed and dated at Peterborough in 1917, but simply that the MacDowell Memorial Association at Peterborough had the pamphlet printed in 1917. The illustrated edition of the pamphlet is identified as the one printed on white laid paper bearing the water mark "Alexandra," so we know exactly which form of the

pamphlet is here referred to even though no mention is made of illustrations in the original notice as given above by Major Whitall.

The next two bibliographies practically repeat Major Whitall's entry in slightly condensed form. The first of these, that by Bradley Fisk, appeared as a supplement to the small book, *Aspects of the Poetry of Edwin Arlington Robinson,* by Lucius Beebe, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1928. On page 105 of this book Mr. Fisk prints in capitals the title of the essay with the date "1916" beneath it, and then adds:

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW: September 1916. Reprinted, 1917, by the MacDowell Memorial Association, Peterborough, N. H., in white paper pamphlet, 7x6.

The third bibliography, that by Lucius Beebe and Robert J. Bulkley, Jr., was published as a separate volume by the Dunster House Bookshop, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931, in a limited edition of 300 numbered copies. Following Fisk, these compilers began their "Prose Items" section with "The Peterborough Idea," and on page 55 they simply repeat verbatim the Fisk entry as given above.

The fourth record of the essay is found in a handsome book describing a display of the magnificent collection of Robinson items owned by Mr. Bacon Collamore of Hartford, Connecticut. The title page of this privately printed and privately distributed book reads as follows: *Edwin Arlington Robinson, 1869–1935: A Collection of His Works from the Library of Bacon Collamore: Hartford: 1936.* The items are arranged strictly in chronological order, with dates in bold-faced type on the margins opposite the several items. The following entries appear on page 19:

THE PETERBOROUGH IDEA: : Robinson's prose essay / **1916** / entitled "The Peterborough Idea" is shown in its first form as a magazine article beginning on page 448 of the *North American Review* for September 1916.

Also exhibited, the first separate printings of / **1917** / THE PETERBOROUGH IDEA, a pamphlet of eleven pages, issued with three

illustrations and bound with staples in a paper wrapper. This copy bears the following autograph inscription on the cover:

First printing
E. A. Robinson

As has been shown above, this illustrated form of the pamphlet was designated by three successive bibliographers as the first printing or edition; and now the inscription on the cover of Mr. Collamore's copy reveals the poet himself as endorsing in his own hand this illustrated edition as the "First printing." Mr. Collamore, who is primarily a collector and lover of Robinson's works rather than a professional bibliographer, and his associate, Mr. Lawrance R. Thompson, who signs the Preface with Mr. Collamore, with all this evidence before them naturally accepted this edition as the first one issued in pamphlet form. Through a period of eleven years or more Mr. Collamore had developed a cordial relationship with Robinson, and hence he was able to give in his book much additional information about the poet's life and interests. He quotes on page 20, for example, part of a letter from Robinson dated at Peterborough, September 6, 1928, as follows:

I am told here that the first reprint of the Peterborough Idea was printed in New York, the second in Cincinnati, and the third in Peterborough. I can't get the dates, and personally know very little about them but apparently yours is the first.

This statement, though it was made by Robinson almost exactly twelve years after the magazine article appeared, comes pretty near to being correct, for, as we shall see later, the first printing of the pamphlet *was* made in New York; but actually there were *two* printings of the pamphlet made in New York by the same firm, a fact which Robinson seems not to have known; and hence the Cincinnati illustrated edition would be third; this would throw the Peterborough edition fourth in the sequence. Note particularly that Robinson admits that he knew very little about the reprints personally, a point which should

be kept in mind when we come to determine the first edition of the pamphlet.

Finally, an elaborate and authoritative work, *A Bibliography of Edwin Alrington Robinson,* by Charles Beecher Hogan, appeared from the Yale University Press in 1936. This is unquestionably the fullest and most satisfactory bibliography that has so far been made for any American poet, and yet here also the current ideas about the first edition of the pamphlet are repeated with some additional details about the format of this illustrated edition. I quote the descriptive part of Mr. Hogan's entry on "The Peterborough Idea" as it appears on pages 50–51 of his book:

> Issued in white paper wrapper, the title printed on front cover. All edges trimmed. The leaves measure 17.8 by 15.2 cms. Six illustrations in the text on three leaves of glossy paper.
>
> Not formally published. Issued early in 1917. The edition was prepared not for sale, but for private distribution.
>
> First edition. (Reprinted five times, and offered for sale on behalf of the Peterborough Bookshop.)

In another section of the book (p. 114) Mr. Hogan records the appearance of the article in the *North American Review* for September, 1916, and adds: "Reprinted as a pamphlet [1917]."

During the autumn of 1936 I wrote to Mrs. Helen E. Hanford, asking her aid in locating and securing for my collection of Robinson items a copy of the first edition of "The Peterborough Idea" pamphlet. She was herself a resident at the Colony for several summers, and after some weeks of effort she secured a copy directly from Mrs. Edward MacDowell and mailed it to me, inclosing with her own letter one written to her by Mrs. MacDowell. I quote the first two sentences of this letter addressed to Mrs. Hanford: "Finally here is the Robinson article. Now I am sure this is the first edition but can't swear it was the first printing." The last sentence greatly excited me, for the copy of the pamphlet which was now before me was not the illustrated one which all the bibliographers had put down as the first edition. I immediately wrote Mrs. Hanford what I knew of the history of the pamphlet

from the sources quoted above and expressed my desire to learn more about the copy which had been sent to me. Mrs. Hanford forwarded my letter to Mrs. MacDowell, and Mrs. MacDowell then wrote to me directly, confirming what she had previously written to Mrs. Hanford. With her permission I quote several significant sentences from Mrs. MacDowell's letter to me, dated February 15, 1938:

> The first reprint was made in New York immediately after the North American Review appeared. There were no pictures. It all went through my hands. Mr. Robinson may not have even known the circumstances and had nothing to do with the printing. It stands to reason that the first copies being made in New York would not have been different to the extent of adding pictures. The idea was to have the printing as nearly like the original North American Review as possible. The copy I sent you was one of about a dozen, carefully put away in a box, marked "not to be sold or given away." This was done so many years ago I could not place the date. Frankly, I *think* these were the first printings of the first edition. I am sure they were printed before those with pictures.

This evidence, I think, should settle definitely the priority of some form of the unillustrated edition of the pamphlet over the illustrated one.

Since this first *unillustrated* form of the pamphlet has never, so far as I know, been described and since with the evidence before me I am convinced that it is indeed the first issue of the first edition, I give here a full description of it.

Front cover: THE PETERBOROUGH IDEA / BY / EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON /. Verso blank.

Acknowledgement in small type at top of p. 3: Reprinted, by permission, from the North American Review of / September, 1916 /.

Caption title on p. 3 (about three quarters of an inch below the acknowledgement): The Peterborough Idea / By Edwin Arlington Robinson /. The first line of the title is in large capitals all of same height (3 cms.); the second line in smaller capitals all of same height (2 cms.).

Printer's imprint: Cosmus & Washburn / 605 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. /. These two lines are printed on the outside of the back cover, lower righthand corner, in very small capitals all of same height (1 cm.).

The pamphlet, measuring 20.5 x 14.7 cms., is fastened with wire staples and printed on unwatermarked, laid paper, twelve pages in

all, pages 3 to 11 of the text proper being numbered in Arabic figures at bottom center.

In this first edition of the pamphlet there is a misprint of *if* for *it*, last word of line 8, p. 3.

A second edition seems to have been called for within a short time after the appearance of the pamphlet, and this same firm of Cosmus & Washburn printed for the MacDowell Memorial Association the second edition in almost the identical form of the first edition as described above. The chief differences or variations are: (1) the size of this second pamphlet is slightly smaller than that of the first, measuring 15.2 x 9 cms. as against 20.5 x 14.7 cms.; (2) the capital letters of the title of the first edition measure 4 cms., while in the second edition they measure 5 cms.; (3) the type is perhaps two millimeters smaller than that of the first edition. Like the first edition, the second is printed on white laid paper, but unlike the first, the paper has a watermark, namely, "Warren's Olde Style." The pamphlet is bound, like the first, with wire staples, and the pages are exactly the same number, though the lines do not run out exactly the same on the parallel pages. The most significant point, however, is that this second edition does not bear the imprint of the firm of Cosmus & Washburn. The misprint of *if* for *it* on page 3, line 8, of the first edition is corrected on page 3, line 7, of this second edition; and on page 5, line 18, of the first edition the comma after *gone* is omitted in the second edition on exactly the same page and line in each pamphlet, namely, page 5, line 18; and on page 8, line 16, of the first edition there is no comma after *probably*, while a comma is inserted after *probably* on page 8, line 17, of the second edition. These three points make up the total number of variations in readings that I have been able to discover in the two texts.

From a letter written to a friend of mine by Mr. Hogan in March, 1939, I learned that this careful bibliographer had just recently been making further study of "The Peterborough Idea" pamphlets himself. Very generously he has put his own conclusions at my disposal. He says that Mrs.

MacDowell cannot be mistaken in her evidence about the first edition of the pamphlet; and then he summarizes his conclusions briefly as follows:

> But, more important, an examination of the texts definitely settles it once and for all. The first issue was printed in New York, on unwatermarked, laid paper, and has the printer's name and address in the lower right corner on the outside of the back cover. The second issue is identical with the first, and printed by the same concern, but it has no name or address on the back cover. The third (the first to be illustrated) was manufactured by somebody in Cincinnati, Mrs. MacDowell does not remember by whom. The fourth (same size as the first, no illustrations) has on the back cover: Transcript Printing Company / Peterborough, N. H./. The fifth and subsequent issues are little small thin things printed on natural tan glossy paper. . . . the third, illustrated, Cincinnati issue . . . simply groans with clerical errors and changes of individual words, obviously not the work of the author. . . . It is decidedly an interloper.

Mr. Hogan also says that he has personally examined and carefully collated all the issues which he mentions above, and I am confident that his conclusions as to the order of the appearance of the pamphlets are substantially correct.

But what additional evidence from the texts themselves have we to prove that the Cosmus & Washburn editions preceded the illustrated edition? The first thing that suggests itself is a comparison of the two texts printed by Cosmus & Washburn (CW) with that of the Illustrated (I) edition of the pamphlet. Through the courtesy of Mr. Hogan I have been able to examine a copy of the illustrated pamphlet, which copy, by the way, was formerly owned by Major Whitall and was inscribed by him under date of 1921 as having been presented to him by the author. For a description of this issue of the pamphlet, see Mr. Hogan's entry on page 223 above.

Upon examining the text of the I edition, I find that it is in every way inferior to the original texts of the magazine article and the CW edition. The CW edition is carefully printed and follows the text of the magazine article closely, except, of course, where Robinson revised that

text especially to fit the needs of a pamphlet for distribution by the Peterborough Colony. The I edition seems to have been tightly set up, as if the printer were trying to save space, and evidently it was very carelessly proofread. Punctuation marks are sometimes omitted where they appear in the original magazine article and in the CW edition, and sometimes marks are inserted where they do not appear in either of these earlier printings. Important words are twice omitted where they appear in the original article; and occasionally words are spelled differently in the I edition from the forms used in the other two printings. In one instance the definite article *The* in the original essay is changed to the indefinite *A* in the I edition, and in another the word *though* is printed *tho.* I have counted eighteen errors which appear in the I edition. However, in the I edition the misprint of *if* for *it,* last word of line 8 on page 3 in the CW edition, has been corrected; but, be it remembered, that error had already been corrected in the second edition printed by Cosmus & Washburn. One other point that will at least suggest that the I edition was modeled on one of the Cosmus & Washburn editions is that the formats of all three pamphlets are quite similar. The front cover titles also are exactly alike except that the capital letters of the name of the author in the CW edition measure 3 cms., while in the I edition they measure 2 cms. Also the wording of the caption title on page 3 is exactly similar except that there is an unnecessary comma inserted after the word *Review* in the I edition.

All these errors would indicate that the illustrated edition was set by an inferior printer and was read by a careless or inefficient proof-reader. I have found no clue to the identity of the firm that printed this edition, nor have I learned anything about the firm that prepared the pictures for insertion in it; but it seems to be fairly certain, from the evidence we have, that this third edition was made in Cincinnati a year or more after the first and second editions had been made by the Comus & Washburn firm in New York. And surely it is not likely that the

CW editions could have been printed from the text of the illustrated edition. It is plain that the original article is the source of the first CW edition, with only such changes as Robinson himself made in the copy. Moreover, since the illustrated edition incorporated all these revisions, it was undoubtedly made from one of the two editions printed by Cosmus & Washburn in New York City.

The exact date of this Cosmus & Washburn edition of the pamphlet, which we may now accept as the first edition, has not so far been definitely determined. Mrs. MacDowell says positively that the first pamphlet reprint was without pictures and was made in New York immediately after the article appeared in the *North American Review* for September, 1916. The period of four full months certainly would afford ample time for such a small essay to be revised by the author and issued as a pamphlet. Though none of the editions of the pamphlet are dated, all the bibliographers, as we have seen, have given the illustrated pamphlet the hypothetical date of 1917 or "early in 1917," and that may be the correct date for the illustrated edition, though in reality this illustrated edition may have appeared as much as a year, or even two or three years, later. In an effort to determine the date of the first pamphlet, I have made some inquiries as to the time that Cosmus & Washburn moved to the address given on the back cover of the first edition. So far as I can find the firm was listed in the old New York telephone directories as at the address "546 Fifth Avenue" from October 11, 1914, to May 11, 1916; and in the directory issues from October 11, 1916, to May 11, 1918, the firm is listed at the address "605 Fifth Avenue." Under date of May 16, 1939, Mr. Stanley C. Allen, Acting Directory Manager of the New York Telephone Company, wrote me as follows: "These listings indicate that the customer contracted to move from 546 to 605 Fifth Avenue some time between May 11, 1916, and October 11, 1916." When we recall Mrs. MacDowell's emphatic evidence as to the first printing, particularly the phrase "immediately after the *North American Review* appeared," and when we know that the firm of Cosmus &

Washburn had already moved to 605 Fifth Avenue some time during the summer of 1916, it is perfectly reasonable to conclude that the first pamphlet edition of "The Peterborough Idea" appeared late in 1916. At any rate, personally I am inclined to accept 1916 as the correct date for the first edition of the pamphlet.

Finally, it may be of interest to students of Robinson's work to see just what changes or revisions the author saw fit to make in revising the original magazine article for the special purposes for which the pamphlet was intended when it was circulated among the "Colonists" and the friends and supporters of the Peterborough Colony outside. I give below in parallel columns the portions of the texts which show any changes. For the convenience of the reader I have indicated by italics all variations between the two texts, whether by changes of words, or omissions, or additions:

The North American Review, September, 1916, Article by Edwin Arlington Robinson, pp. 448–454.	*The Peterborough Idea, Pamphlet*, imprint of "Cosmus & Washburn, 605 Fifth Avenue, N. Y." No date.
Passages from the Magazine	*Passages from the Pamphlet*
P. 451, lines 13–19:	P. 7, lines 14–23:
In view of some of the more grotesque and pathetic misconceptions concerning it, it may be well to say at once that it implies *neither* a school, a sanitarium, a summer resort for incurable amateurs, or an experiment in misapplied aesthetics. There are no "students," for the simple reason that there is no place for them.	In view of some of the more grotesque and pathetic misconceptions concerning it, it may be well to say at once that it *is not* a school *or* a sanitarium, *or* a summer resort for incurable amateurs, or an experiment in misapplied aesthetics, *or a kind of protracted and intensified afternoon tea. As a matter of fact afternoon tea is not encouraged, although it has not yet been entirely eradicated.* There are no "students," for the simple reason that there is no place for them.
P. 452, lines 36–40:	P. 9, lines 19–23:
The abrupt and somewhat humiliating sense of isolation, liberty,	The abrupt and somewhat humiliating sense of isolation, liberty,

and opportunity which overtakes one each morning *on his way to work* has something to do wit it.

P. 453, lines 29–36:

The mere fact that a man or a woman has written a few books, or painted a few pictures, or composed a few songs, or modeled a few images in clay, means little or nothing *now* among intelligent people. In fact, it is rather a distinction *nowadays* not to have done one or more of these things—unless one has done something sufficiently forceful and original to be suggestive, at least, of endurance.

P. 454, lines 4–11 (end of article):

At any rate, it was with this probability in mind that the creator of the Peterborough Colony as it is today, Mrs. Edward MacDowell, found herself ready and eager to sacrifice everything else *for* the *noble and* unselfish and effective realization of what was once a thought in the mind of Edward MacDowell: *a thought that is now an achieved—and, it is to be hoped, an enduring—ideal.*

[Signed]

EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON

and opportunity which overtakes one each morning has something to do with it.

P. 10, lines 22–30:

The mere fact that a man or a woman has written a few books, or painted a few pictures, or composed a few songs, or modeled a few images in clay, means little or nothing *nowadays* among intelligent people. In fact, it is *coming to be* rather a distinction not to have done one or more of these things—unless ane has done something sufficiently forceful and original to be suggestive,, at least, of endurance.

P. 11, lines 6–15:

At any rate, it was with this probability in mind that the creator of the Peterborough Colony as it is today, Mrs. Edward MacDowell, found herself ready and eager to sacrifice everything else *to* the unselfish and effective realization of what was once a thought in the mind of Edward MacDowell *and is now five hundred acres of land, partly farm but largely forest, and a score of detached and carefully constructed buildings that have a gratifying suggestion of permanence.*

P. 11, lines 16–27, new concluding paragraph:

I fancy that Mrs. MacDowell is tired of praise, and that she is wishing to herself that the confidence and the encouragement of some of her admirers might begin to assume another form. But there is no need of my dwelling upon the obvious. If I have given my readers a nearer picture of the

> *place than they had before, and a clearer notion of what it means and is going to mean, I shall at least have corrected for them a few of the more fantastic and unfortunate errors that have long been circulated in regard to an enterprise that has been from its inception in accord with everything that is rational, natural and desirable.*

In the first of these revisions Robinson corrected a rather loose and unidiomatic *neither—or* sentence. And then, apparently, he could not resist the temptation to strike a light note by slipping in his favorite gibe on the Peterborough afternoon teas. These teas were held on Sundays at the central Colony House, and all the Colonists were expected to attend, though they were not required to do so. As a matter of duty Robinson attended these functions more or less regularly, but he did not enjoy them. The new concluding paragraph prepared by Robinson gracefully incorporates a compliment to Mrs. MacDowell, followed by a subtle appeal for a more generous financial support by the public of an enterprise which, as the poet says, "has been from its inception in accord with everything that is rational, natural, and desirable." Certainly it proved to be the rational and desirable thing for Robinson.